

PUBLIC MEETING

POST-SHUTDOWN DECOMMISSIONING ACTIVITIES REPORT
FOR THE
MAINE YANKEE ATOMIC POWER STATION

THURSDAY, NOVEMBER 6, 1997

WISCASSET HIGH SCHOOL

WISCASSET, MAINE

7:00 P.M.

THE REPORTING GROUP
170 U.S. Route 1, Falmouth, Maine 04105
(207) 781-3728

MODERATOR

Senator Marge KilKelly

NRC STAFF

Michael Webb
Project Manager

Dr. Michael Masnik
Section Chief

Dr. Seymour W. Weiss
Project Director

Michael Callahan
Congressional Affairs Officer

Rick Rasmussen
Senior Resident Inspector

Curt Cowgill
Projects Branch

Dr. Ronald Bellamy
Chief, Decommissioning Branch

Neil Sheehan
Office of Public Affairs

Ann Hodgdon
Office of General Counsel

Clayton L. Pittiglio, Jr., P.E.
Division of Waste Management

Etoy Hylton
Licensing Assistant

Dan Dorman
Project Manager

John L. Minns
Project Engineer

THE REPORTING GROUP
(207) 781-3728

1 PROCEEDINGS

2 SEN. KILKELLY: Good evening. My name is Marge
3 Kilkelly. I'm the State Senator for Lincoln County.
4 I'm also the chair of the Community Advisory Panel on
5 Decommissioning Maine Yankee, and I'll be moderating
6 this meeting tonight.

7 This is a meeting being held by the NRC for the
8 purpose of soliciting comments about the post-shutdown
9 decommissioning activities report for Maine Yankee
10 atomic power station. There are a number of, first of
11 all, just housekeeping details that I'd like to get
12 through in terms of the process for tonight's meeting.

13 First, there will be a presentation by Mike Meisner
14 and Mary Ann Lynch from Maine Yankee, and they will go
15 over plans for post-shutdown activities report and the
16 plan for that process. That will be followed by Mike
17 Webb and members of the NRC, who will then do a
18 presentation on the decommissioning process and the role
19 of the NRC in that process. At that point there will be
20 an opportunity for questions, and that will be followed
21 by an opportunity for public comment.

22 The purpose of having the questions first is so that
23 the folks that have been presenting material, if it's
24 possible for them to answer those questions right away,
25 they will be available to do that. If they can't, then

1 those answers will get back to you, either from the NRC
2 or from Maine Yankee, as is appropriate.

3 What I would ask for people that do have questions
4 is that you be respectful of the fact that there is both
5 a question time and a comment time; and we'd like to get
6 through the question piece, so if you have a simple
7 question that you wish to ask, please do that. If you
8 have a long statement to make or a comment, please wait
9 until the comment time to do that, so that people who
10 have signed up for comments will have an opportunity to
11 do that.

12 When you come to the microphone -- this meeting is
13 being transcribed. When you come to the microphone, we
14 ask that you state your name, spell your last name, and
15 then state where you're from. And if you're
16 representing an organization or a group, if you would
17 please also indicate that.

18 We are trying to keep very precise records of the
19 comments that we're receiving and the questions we're
20 receiving, and that will help us greatly in that
21 process.

22 There are restrooms out the back door and to the
23 left, and there are also juice machines and water
24 machines, and that sort of thing, and certainly folks
25 are free to come and go as they need.

1 It is our hope to wrap this meeting up by about 10
2 o'clock tonight; however, we will stay as long as is
3 necessary for folks to make their comments.

4 There are a number of people that I'd like to
5 introduce at this time. First, the Citizens Advisory
6 Panel. That is a group that has been meeting on a very
7 regular basis. I joked earlier tonight, I'm starting to
8 see more of them than my family, which is kind of a
9 scary thing. But it's a great group of people, so I
10 appreciate their company.

11 Members of the Community Advisory Panel that are
12 here tonight include John Chester, Paul Crary, Don
13 Hudson, who's also the vice chair of the CAP, Raymond
14 Shadis -- Ray's here someplace.

15 MR. SHADIS: I'm back here.

16 SEN. KILKELLY: There you go.

17 Dan Thompson, and Uldis Vanags, who serves on the
18 committee, and also, for this evening, is representing
19 the Governor's Office.

20 Are there members of the CAP that I've missed? I
21 think I've got everybody.

22 There are a number of Legislators that are here
23 tonight also; Representative Joe Taylor and Senator
24 Spike Carey, who both serve on the Utilities Committee,
25 and Senator Sharon Treat, who is the Senate chair of the

1 Natural Resources Committee. And I also notice Steve
2 Ward, who's the public advocate, is here as well.
3 Great.

4 So, without further ado, we will now begin with a
5 presentation by the licensee, Maine Yankee, outlining
6 the decommissioning program for the facility.

7 MS. LYNCH: Good evening. My name is Mary Ann Lynch
8 and I'm an attorney for Maine Yankee, and I also serve
9 as vice president of law and public affairs.

10 Next to me is Mike Meisner, who is vice president of
11 nuclear safety and regulatory affairs.

12 First, on behalf of Maine Yankee, I would like very
13 much to thank all the members of the public and public
14 officials who have turned out tonight to hear this
15 presentation and to ask questions of Maine Yankee and
16 the NRC regarding Maine Yankee's decommissioning plans.
17 We welcome your input. That is why we sought the
18 creation of a Community Advisory Panel earlier this
19 year, which I will discuss briefly with you later in our
20 presentation.

21 Tonight we plan to discuss in broad terms Maine
22 Yankee's plans for decommissioning, and we'll try to
23 answer any questions that you may have. I will begin
24 with a brief presentation regarding Maine Yankee's
25 mission. Mike will take over to discuss the PSDAR, the

1 status of site characterization, and he will also
2 explain to you why Maine Yankee has made certain
3 assumptions in coming up with the decommissioning plan.
4 I will wrap up our presentation with a discussion of how
5 we intend to fund decommissioning, an important part of
6 the process, and a discussion of community involvement.

7 I understand that questions will follow later. And
8 we will both also be here for the duration of the
9 evening, if any one wants to ask us questions in the
10 back of the room as well.

11 So, with that, we'll start. And I apologize to
12 those of you who have been at the previous NRC meetings
13 or some of the Community Advisory Panel meetings if this
14 is repetitive, but there is a much larger crowd tonight.

15 First of all, Maine Yankee's mission is to safely
16 and cost-effectively decontaminate and dismantle the
17 plant in order to restore the site for future use. We
18 hope to do this while being responsive to the community
19 and to employees.

20 This is a picture of how the Maine Yankee site looks
21 today.

22 Next slide.

23 This is what we hope it will look like several years
24 down the road, after we have removed the reactor
25 building and the turbine hall. What you essentially see

1 left is the spent fuel pool and the staff building.

2 I'd also point out in the lower left-hand corner are
3 the transmission facilities.

4 Next slide.

5 This is what Maine Yankee may look like five to ten
6 years down the road, if Maine Yankee develops a dry-cask
7 storage facility for the management of the spent fuel.

8 We do not believe at this point, as Mike will explain
9 later, that the Department of Energy will come any time
10 in the near future to accept the waste. So that's what
11 it will look like in an interim period.

12 I would point out that we are on a dual track.
13 There are no firm plans for dry cask today, but we do
14 need to plan for that eventuality.

15 And I would also point out that this is just for
16 illustrative purposes in terms of site. Maine Yankee,
17 as many of you know, has a 740-acre site. So it may
18 well be that even if we were to go down that road, that
19 the casks would not necessarily be located on that
20 particular location.

21 Eric, next slide.

22 And hopefully, then, a goal I think all of you in
23 this room share, our goal is to have the Maine Yankee
24 site look like that as soon as possible. You'll notice
25 again in the left-hand corner the transmission

1 facilities. Those facilities are not owned by Maine
2 Yankee. Our decommissioning plan doesn't deal with them
3 at all. And presumably, they would be available for a
4 future use of the site.

5 Thanks, Eric.

6 MR. MEISNER: Good evening. I want to start out by
7 talking in general terms about the Maine Yankee PSDAR.
8 I think you all know we submitted back on August 27th,
9 and this public meeting is a direct result of that
10 submittal.

11 The PSDAR itself looks at decommissioning from a
12 broad point of view. It discusses the assumptions that
13 we made in decommissioning planning, the scheduled major
14 activities, and the cost estimate. It also allows us to
15 reaffirm our commitment to safety commissioning, both
16 from a radiation protection point of view, which as long
17 as we have nuclear fuel on the site, is the number one
18 priority at Maine Yankee, and an industrial safety point
19 of view.

20 And if you've read the PSDAR, you know that there is
21 a discussion also about the bounding effects of previous
22 environmental impact statements, both on a
23 plant-specific basis from Maine Yankee, and a generic
24 environmental impact statement basis developed by the
25 Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

1 As Mary Ann indicated, we've really discussed most
2 of these topics in detail in one form or another,
3 particularly at the last public meeting with the NRC.
4 So what we wanted to do tonight was take a few selected
5 topics and discuss those in a little more detail, and,
6 in some cases, provide updated information. For
7 instance, Mary Ann later will be talking about the
8 updated cost study, which wasn't available at the time
9 we submitted the PSDAR.

10 So, decommissioning planning is very important to
11 us. And one thing that we really haven't emphasized
12 before is, for Maine Yankee that began last May, not in
13 August. You'll recall last May the board of directors
14 decided to slow down in restarting the plant, looking
15 towards either another buyer -- a buyer for the plant,
16 or to ultimately shut it down.

17 And at that point we initiated a number of things
18 within the organization that were, in large measure,
19 solely devoted to decommissioning plans. For instance,
20 the PSDAR is one product of that. And while we
21 submitted that very few weeks after the board decision
22 to finally shut down, it was the product of a number of
23 months of intensive effort within the staff.

24 Nonetheless, the way you'd like to go into an
25 activity like this is to have a one or two-year planning

1 period and to orderly shut down the plant at its
2 licensed life. That didn't happen with Maine Yankee,
3 and with the decision to prematurely decommission, we
4 are now faced with roughly a year of planning, with no
5 major decommissioning activities anticipated until
6 roughly the August-September time frame next year.

7 What we're doing right now and what we have been
8 doing for some months is preparation activities and
9 planning, and that will continue well into next summer.

10 Some of the things we're focusing on right now in
11 the area of safety is to redesign the spent fuel pool
12 and make it essentially what we call a nuclear island,
13 so that it is largely disconnected from the rest of the
14 plant from the point of view of electricity, water
15 systems, mechanical systems, and the like, so that
16 activities in the plant, once we start major
17 decommissioning activities, can't have any adverse
18 impact on the nuclear island itself.

19 So, isolating the nuclear island from the rest of
20 the plant is under design now, and we expect to have
21 that implemented, the results of the design changes,
22 implemented by roughly the end of March next year.

23 We're also looking at activities like RCS
24 decontamination. That's an important element to us from
25 the viewpoint of worker radiation exposure. We need to

1 make sure that as people start active activities in the
2 plant, that the radiation dose that they're exposed to
3 is as low as we can make it.

4 So we have a number of bids in right now that we're
5 evaluating to do chemical cleaning and decontamination
6 of the reactor coolant system, and we expect to have a
7 recommendation in roughly another week on how to go with
8 that activity. And I believe we'll probably do the
9 decontamination, itself, near the end of the year or
10 very beginning of next year.

11 And we have a number of other preparation activities
12 going on to set up for the long-term dismantling of the
13 plant; things like asbestos removal.

14 And we're also laying the foundation in a number of
15 areas for the major dismantling activities. Now that
16 the plant is shut down, there's no longer fuel in the
17 reactor vessel. Many of the systems and components that
18 were important to safety no longer are, and we're going
19 through a system reclassification effort to essentially
20 downgrade those systems so as to be able to more
21 directly focus our personnel and resources on what's
22 important to safety, and that's the spent fuel pool
23 management and radiation protection throughout the
24 facility.

25 As I think Mary Ann indicated, we have started the

1 site characterization. That's roughly a five- to
2 six-month effort to do a detailed study on the grounds
3 of the site, as well as within the facility buildings,
4 to determine the exact levels of radioactive
5 contamination in there and to serve as the basis for the
6 long-term plan in dismantling the facility.

7 That's a very detailed study. If any of you out
8 there are interested in how that's progressing, that's
9 one of the standard update activities that we do with
10 the Community Advisory Panel whenever they meet, and
11 they've been meeting roughly every four weeks or so.

12 I think the next meeting that we have scheduled --
13 we may not have firmed it up exactly, but I think it's
14 December 2nd, a Tuesday, and we'll be giving an update
15 on the status of the site characterization, as well as
16 providing a detailed discussion on emergency planning
17 and the analyses that underlie what we plan for in
18 emergency situations.

19 And, of course, funding needs to be focused on.
20 Mary Ann will talk later about the filing with the
21 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission, and that funding
22 is to be available in order to support the
23 decommissioning activities.

24 So, I'd like to take a few minutes and go through
25 our thought process and some of the key decisions that

1 have to be made in order to decommission the plant.

2 And the first such decision is deciding between
3 what's called DECON, which is immediate decontamination
4 and dismantlement, and SAFSTOR, which is essentially a
5 delayed DECON for up to 60 years under NRC regulations.

6 When we look at the other facilities that have gone
7 through or are in the process of doing decommissioning,
8 we find some interesting information as far as DECON
9 versus SAFSTOR. Virtually all single-unit facilities,
10 like Maine Yankee, tend to go towards the immediate
11 decontamination and dismantlement approach. There's a
12 couple of plants that have been completed, Shoreham and
13 Fort St. Vrain, and you can see another five to six that
14 are in process in DECON right now.

15 The SAFSTOR method is preferred for multi-unit
16 facilities. You can see, for instance, San Onofre 1 on
17 the list up there as one of three plants out in
18 California. San Onofre 1 was shut down several years
19 ago. San Onofre 2 and 3 still have a number of years
20 left in their licensed life. And for multi-unit owners,
21 it only made sense to delay the decommissioning of the
22 early shut-down plants until all the plants are being
23 decommissioned. So that you will have some in SAFSTOR,
24 and the last one will start the DECON process.

25 And there are some other facilities, and you can see

1 the list up there, that are in fairly anomalous
2 situations compared Maine Yankee. Rancho Seco, for
3 instance, in California is owned by a public municipal
4 district that had different funding issues to deal with
5 than Maine Yankee. And most of the rest are small test
6 reactor type of facilities that were shut down years
7 ago, before even the debate between SAFSTOR and DECON
8 was raised.

9 We can compare the two processes from the safety
10 point of view. They're essentially equivalent. If you
11 look at SAFSTOR and want to calculate out your numbers,
12 you will see that on a calculational basis, SAFSTOR will
13 result in somewhat lower occupational doses over time,
14 which only makes sense, because the longer you wait the
15 more radioactive materials decay.

16 On the other hand, to go into a SAFSTOR situation
17 for a period of years, you really need to downsize your
18 staff to the bare minimum needed for SAFSTOR. And when
19 you finally go into DECON, you're faced with the fact
20 that you no longer have experienced personnel at that
21 facility, health physicists and the like, who are aware
22 of the radiation problems and situations. And that lack
23 of familiar personnel tends to offset the benefit,
24 because you can't do as good a job in maintaining doses
25 as low as reasonably achievable for your staff.

1 And either DECON or SAFSTOR, from a regulatory point
2 of view, come up with occupational doses well below what
3 the NRC considers an acceptable level for
4 decommissioning.

5 You can also compare the two approaches from the
6 cost point of view. We did this explicitly in our
7 previous decommissioning study in 1993, and there was a
8 clear difference of some \$40 million at that time in
9 favor of taking the DECON approach.

10 So, what we decided to do as an initial decision is
11 to proceed with DECON. That's the assumption that we
12 made in our cost studies, and it makes the most sense
13 for a single-unit facility. From a safety point of
14 view, it's essentially equivalent to SAFSTOR, and it's
15 clearly the lowest cost.

16 And practically speaking, too, because of Maine
17 Yankee's shut down history -- you all know we've been
18 shut down since December of last year, and we won't be
19 conducting any major decommissioning activities until
20 August or September of next year -- we have close to a
21 two-year SAFSTOR period, for all practical purposes,
22 before we go into the DECON process.

23 Another decision we needed to grapple with was the
24 end use of the site; how we wanted it to look when we
25 were done with the regulatorily required activities.

1 And we looked at three alternatives, the first being
2 radiological cleanup only.

3 Eric, if you'd put up the next one.

4 That is the NRC minimum requirement in order to
5 terminate the Maine Yankee license and release the site
6 for unrestricted use. The problem with that approach is
7 that in the process of decommissioning, inside
8 buildings, for instance, in order to remove the
9 contamination, we actually take out sections of walls or
10 cut several inches into concrete to remove the
11 contamination materials. And when you get through that
12 process, I've heard it described as something akin to
13 the buildings are left in a Swiss cheese situation; that
14 they're not safe; that you need to maintain security
15 over it; you need to maintain maintenance. And, as you
16 do that, those maintenance and security costs tend to
17 add up over time. And in the long run, this is really
18 probably the most expensive option to choose to do the
19 bare minimum.

20 We looked at alternate uses for the site once the
21 decontamination and dismantling is done. And it seems
22 like one of the most realistic uses is to repower the
23 site.

24 And we do have a feasibility review under way at
25 Maine Yankee. And most of you know that come next March

1 or April, we'll be choosing a decommissioning contractor
2 to carry out the bulk of the dismantling activities.
3 And we will request and expect to receive a number of
4 proposals to repower the site. Most of what we've heard
5 about have to do with gas-fired generating facilities,
6 which could make use of some of the site infrastructure,
7 such as the transmission lines.

8 Other uses are uncertain. I mean, conceptually, you
9 could go anywhere from a park plan to condos to movie
10 theaters, but we've not heard of any concrete interest
11 or proposals along those lines.

12 And the final choice here is building demolition, or
13 essentially, green-fielding. That is the assumption we
14 made in our study for decommissioning costs. From a
15 cost-certainty point of view, it is the best
16 characterized and best known. It does allow for other
17 uses of the site when the decommissioning period is
18 over.

19 And in order to really leave open the possibility
20 for alternate uses of this site, we've decided to not
21 include in our cost estimates demolition of the staff
22 building or office building, the diffuser and
23 circulating water pumphouse as infrastructure that may
24 be useful for a repowered site. Those are potentially
25 useful if we decide to go to full green-fielding and no

1 alternative site use. Then we would go in later to
2 recover the costs for that final demolition.

3 I'd like to talk for a few minutes now about nuclear
4 fuel, spent fuel. It's problematic. Although, not
5 strictly speaking, part of the NRC's definition of
6 decommissioning -- they separate that out -- it is a
7 major element in our decommissioning plan.

8 Most of you know that the Department of Energy is
9 obligated to begin removing spent nuclear fuel this
10 January. Realistically, of course, that won't happen.
11 In fact, the earliest dates we're hearing about that the
12 DOE could be in position to start taking nuclear fuel is
13 in 2010.

14 Maine Yankee customers have paid on the order now of
15 \$192 million in order to make this happen. And there is
16 federal legislation and ongoing court cases that could
17 force the DOE to act sooner. But their performance to
18 date suggests that it's probably unlikely.

19 We retain the responsibility for safeguarding that
20 fuel until DOE can remove it. And as part of the cost
21 estimates that Mary Ann will be sharing with you later,
22 you'll see that a significant fraction, some \$128
23 million, is for nothing more than spent fuel management.

24 We intend to pursue all remedies against DOE. That
25 may include legislative or legal remedies. And, as part

1 of our cost study, we assume that fuel will remain on
2 the site. The last fuel bundle will leave the site in
3 the year 2023.

4 And just to avoid confusion, when DOE does finally
5 come in to take the fuel, they don't take it all at
6 once. They do kind of a round-robin gathering of fuel
7 from plants all around the country. They'll take a few
8 bundles here, a few bundles in another place, a few
9 bundles down the road, and you won't get your final fuel
10 off-site for maybe, we're estimating, a 13-year period
11 from the earliest time that they start.

12 So, in the context of an extended period of fuel
13 maintenance, we need to plan for the safest and most
14 economical way to do that. Two proven technologies
15 today: We can leave the fuel in wet storage with the
16 spent fuel pool, and, like I said, isolate that from the
17 rest of the plant, which will be done anyway; or, at
18 some point down the road, we could go to dry storage.
19 And in that situation we take fuel bundles and load them
20 into massive casks. And, as the picture Mary Ann showed
21 you earlier depicted, these casks sit on a concrete slab
22 with appropriate security and monitoring.

23 From a safety point of view, we believe, and most
24 plants in the country believe, that dry storage is at
25 least equivalent to wet storage. And from a cost point

1 of view, there seem to be some clear advantages.

2 Now, as Mary Ann indicated, we haven't made final
3 decisions on this yet. In fact, I just got yesterday a
4 final study that we had commissioned to examine the cost
5 tradeoffs of these two approaches. And there's a
6 decided advantage to dry storage, on the order of \$30
7 million for the period up to 2023 that I mentioned.
8 Many people think that DOE, in fact, will not be able to
9 take all the fuel until 2026 or '28, in which case your
10 up in the \$40 million dollar range for your dry storage
11 and management.

12 One of the problems in choosing between these two is
13 that there are some up-front capital costs associated
14 with obtaining these casks and constructing the storage
15 facility. And it's not until, in our study, roughly
16 year 11 that the dry-storage is favorable to wet
17 storage.

18 So, if you were to postulate that DOE, next year,
19 will take the fuel, clearly you'd maintain a wet storage
20 facility. On the other hand, if you're going beyond 11
21 years in maintaining that fuel, it looks like dry
22 storage is a clear favorite.

23 But we intend, at a Community Advisory Panel meeting
24 down the road, to lay out all of the facts that we've
25 assembled on this, and we're really looking for the

1 advisory panel to weigh in on this issue.

2 And at this point I'll turn it back to Mary Ann.

3 MS. LYNCH: Thank you, Mike. As some of you know
4 who've read the newspaper in the last couple of days,
5 Maine Yankee did file a rate case this week with the
6 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission to seek to recover
7 the remainder of the decommissioning costs.

8 We have approximately \$195 million set aside in
9 trust, but that is not enough money. We routinely --
10 that is, every three to five years -- do a study of the
11 cost estimate to update and make sure that we are
12 collecting at the proper level. We had started a study
13 earlier this year. In fact, we had started it before we
14 knew we were shutting down, so we were quite fortunate
15 to have had that work well under way, and it was not a
16 case of putting this together quickly in the last couple
17 of months since August. This is work that I think has
18 been going on since February or March.

19 Eric, I think, has a slide up there which shows you
20 the major contributors to the decommissioning costs.
21 These are cost estimates that run from 1998 up to the
22 year 2023, when the Department of Energy, we assume,
23 will have completed its pickup of the waste, and then we
24 could finally decommission and load the waste on
25 transportation, and then finally decommission the site.

1 We currently are collecting \$14.9 million a year --
2 oh, I should point out one other thing, Eric, about that
3 last slide. I'm sorry.

4 Those figures are updated since the PSDAR filing.
5 At the time that document was sent to the NRC, we did
6 not have this study completed. So, those numbers are
7 different than the ones in the PSDAR filing.

8 We're currently collecting \$14.9 million a year, and
9 have been for about three or four years. It was a lower
10 level before that. We are seeking to increase the
11 collections to \$36.4 million.

12 Essentially, we need \$357 million to do the NRC
13 minimum. We need another \$23 million to demolish the
14 buildings, as Mike discussed, and restore the site to a
15 point where it can be used for other purposes.

16 We have excluded from that, as I think he mentioned,
17 the diffuser and the circulating water pumphouse and the
18 staff building on the assumption that those might be
19 usable.

20 If, as a result of site characterization or lack of
21 interest in developing the site, those are not usable,
22 we would be seeking to have the funding to demolish
23 those buildings and completely restore the site.

24 The final number is the cost of the spent fuel
25 management out to the year 2023, and is the biggest

1 difference from the previous study, which was \$377
2 million in 1997 dollars. That previous study did not
3 have the longer term for fuel management and did not
4 include in it the cost of the dry-cask facility, because
5 at the time we assumed that the plant would operate to
6 the year 2008 and that the Department of Energy would
7 complete its pickup of the waste by 2018. So, using
8 that break-even point of 10 or 11 years, we did not, in
9 1993, when we did the last study, foresee the need for
10 dry-cask storage.

11 As I mentioned, we did file this case with the
12 Federal Energy Regulatory Commission. We expect that
13 Maine's public advocate, the PUC, the small municipal
14 customers throughout New England, and probably every
15 public utilities commission in New England to intervene
16 in that case.

17 The positions tend to be a little bit different.
18 While they all represent customers, I think local public
19 officials here in Maine have historically had a higher
20 sensitivity to the need to have adequate decommissioning
21 funding so that the site can be decommissioned and
22 restored. And that has not been a sensitivity shared by
23 customers to the south of the Kittery bridge.

24 Lastly, we wanted to discuss the issue of public
25 involvement tonight, because we have had a -- I think a

1 somewhat unique experience here in Maine. The Community
2 Advisory Panel was created this summer as the primary
3 means for us to understand and hear of the public's
4 concerns regarding the decommissioning of Maine Yankee.
5 We were fortunate in that the Governor of Maine agreed
6 to name four people to that panel.

7 We were fortunate in the diverse and varied
8 backgrounds of the people who agreed to so kindly share
9 their time on this mission. There are representatives
10 from state government, local government, the marine
11 industry, environmental groups, the anti-nuclear group,
12 emergency planning -- I'm sure I'm missing some, but it
13 is a very, very diverse group of individuals.

14 And Maine Yankee is looking to the Community
15 Advisory Panel for advice on the choices that we make,
16 particularly on the choices that will impact on the
17 local community.

18 So far, the Community Advisory Panel has met three
19 times since Maine Yankee was shut down in August. Every
20 meeting is open to the public. It is noticed in the
21 local paper. It is noticed on the Maine Yankee web
22 site. And it has a public comment period.

23 We are still engaged in sort of a shake-down effort
24 on our web site. We're trying to make that more
25 current. And we don't have all of the kinks out of it,

1 but it really is an attempt by Maine Yankee to hear from
2 the public. And I'd like to use this opportunity
3 tonight to encourage people to attend CAP meetings.

4 I'd like to summarize. We believe that immediate
5 dismantlement and site restoration is the best choice
6 for safely and cost-effectively decommissioning the
7 Maine Yankee plant and restoring the site for future
8 use.

9 We feel that dry-cask storage may be the best option
10 long-term; however, we are proceeding on a path that at
11 least for the near term does not preclude wet storage
12 and is essentially a dual path.

13 As Mike mentioned, we are doing a feasibility study
14 of possible alternative uses for the site, and we
15 welcome any suggestions.

16 Mike didn't mention it, but I know the Wiscasset
17 town planner has had some discussion about a possible
18 industrial park as a use, too. So we are open to any
19 suggestions.

20 Again, I just want to thank you all for coming
21 tonight. We welcome your questions and look forward to
22 having a dialogue with you as we go through this process
23 over the coming years.

24 Thank you.

25 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you Mary Ann and Mike.

1 And now we will turn it over to the NRC for their
2 presentation.

3 MR. WEBB: Good evening. For the benefit of those
4 of you who were not at the public meeting held last
5 month, I'd like to introduce myself as the NRC
6 decommissioning project manager for Maine Yankee. I
7 work out of NRC headquarters in Rockville, Maryland, and
8 I'm a member of the NRC reactor decommissioning section.
9 We've have oversight responsibility for 16 commercial
10 power reactors that are in various stages of
11 decommissioning throughout the United States. I'll be
12 the principal point of contact at NRC headquarters for
13 the decommissioning of Maine Yankee.

14 I'd like to thank everyone for being here this
15 evening. We do appreciate that you do have an interest
16 in the decommissioning of Maine Yankee and that you've
17 taken your time to be here this evening.

18 As Ms. Kilkelly stated earlier, the purpose of
19 tonight's meeting is to inform you about the Maine
20 Yankee Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activities Report,
21 or PSDAR, but it's also to gather comments and answer
22 questions about Maine Yankee's decommissioning. And
23 because we anticipate that a major portion of tonight's
24 meeting will be devoted to receiving your comments and
25 answering your questions, we've brought several NRC

1 staff members here to address your concerns.

2 So I would like to introduce those people. And if
3 each of you could raise your hand, please, when I call
4 your name, so people will know who you are.

5 My immediate supervisor is Dr. Michael Masnik. Mike
6 is the section chief for decommissioning, and he
7 supervises eight project managers who are assigned to
8 the oversight of power reactor decommissioning.

9 Mike's immediate supervisor is Dr. Seymour Weiss.
10 As our project director, Sy also has responsibility for
11 non-power reactors.

12 Rick Rasmussen is the NRC senior resident inspector
13 assigned to Maine Yankee. Rick is the NRC's on-site
14 representative at the plant, and his duties are to
15 observe and inspect day-to-day activities. Rick reports
16 to our Region I office, which is located in King of
17 Prussia, Pennsylvania, and his supervisor there is
18 Mr. Curt Cowgill.

19 Dr. Ron Bellamy is branch chief for decommissioning
20 of Region I. His group will assume Region I
21 responsibility for Maine Yankee in the near future.

22 Also here from King of Prussia is Neil Sheehan of
23 the Region I office of public affairs.

24 Ann Hodgdon is an attorney from our NRC
25 headquarters, Office of General Counsel. She's one of

1 our legal specialists on decommissioning.

2 Larry Pittiglio is from our headquarters Office of
3 Nuclear Materials Safety and Safeguards. The license
4 termination plan that we'll discuss this evening is
5 reviewed by Larry's group down at headquarters.

6 Etoy Hylton is our licensing assistant, and she's
7 here to assist in administrative issues this evening.

8 Dan Dorman was my immediate predecessor as Maine
9 Yankee project manager while the plant was operating.

10 And finally, from NRC headquarters, John Minns, a
11 project engineer assigned to our staff.

12 Before we receive your questions and comments on the
13 PSDAR, I thought it would be helpful, particularly for
14 people who weren't here on October 7, to briefly go
15 through the decommissioning process from the time Maine
16 Yankee permanently ceased operations through termination
17 of the license.

18 Within 30 days of a licensee's decision to
19 permanently shut down, they're required to submit
20 written certification to the NRC that they have
21 permanently ceased operations. Once they've removed
22 fuel from the spent fuel pool -- I'm sorry, from the
23 reactor vessel, they must submit a second certification.
24 What this does is prevents them from operating the plant
25 and it prevents them from moving the fuel back into the

1 reactor vessel. Maine Yankee provided these two
2 certifications to us in a single letter dated August 7,
3 1997.

4 May I have the next slide, please? Actually, that's
5 all right.

6 Our regulations require that within two years of
7 submitting -- or permanently ceasing operations, that
8 the licensee must submit this Post-Shutdown
9 Decommissioning Activities Report, or PSDAR. Maine
10 Yankee submitted the PSDAR to us on August 27, 1997.

11 The PSDAR includes the items that you see here on
12 this list: A description of the activities they intend
13 to conduct, a schedule of how they intend to accomplish
14 them, an estimate of the expected cost, and a discussion
15 that provides the basis for concluding that the
16 environmental impacts associated with their
17 decommissioning fall within the bounds of the Generic
18 Environmental Impact Statement that the NRC conducted,
19 as well as with a final environmental statement that was
20 issued by the NRC when the plant started operations.

21 In addition to the preliminary cost estimate the
22 PSDAR requires, within two years of operation they also
23 have to submit a more detailed site-specific
24 decommissioning cost estimate. So, in Maine Yankee's
25 case, this report is due in August of 1999.

1 The purpose of that submittal is to assure that the
2 funds necessary to decommission the facility are in
3 place relatively early in the process. Maine Yankee has
4 not yet submitted their site-specific cost estimate to
5 the NRC, so, as a consequence, our regulations would not
6 allow them to access more than 23% of the value of the
7 generic decommissioning fund that our regulations cite.

8 The NRC placed a notice in the Federal Register on
9 receipt of the PSDAR and made it available to the
10 public. And we've also scheduled this meet to allow
11 Maine Yankee to present their plans for decommissioning
12 of the facility, describe the NRC's role during
13 decommissioning, and to respond to your questions and to
14 receive your comments.

15 Next slide, please.

16 The PSDAR provides five functions:

17 First, to provide a general overview to the public
18 and the NRC of their planned decommissioning activities;

19 Second, it notifies the NRC staff in sufficient time
20 for us to conduct safety inspections prior to the
21 initiation of any major decommissioning activities;

22 It also allows the NRC staff enough time to plan for
23 the appropriate level of inspection of their activities
24 during decommissioning;

25 And, we feel it requires the licensee, prior to any

1 major activities, to examine their plans for the funding
2 of the decommissioning;

3 And, finally, to ensure that the plans the licensee
4 has for decommissioning will not result in environmental
5 impacts that have not been previously considered.

6 Before the expiration of the 90-day period from
7 which they submit the PSDAR, Maine Yankee is prohibited
8 from undertaking any major decommissioning activities.

9 May we have the next slide.

10 Since you may ask, well, what is a major
11 decommissioning activity, here's the definition. And,
12 as you can see, among these actions is an activity that
13 results in permanent removal of major radioactive
14 components. And I realize that may then raise the
15 question, well, what is a major radioactive component.

16 Those components are defined again in our
17 regulations as the reactor vessel, steam generators,
18 pressurizers, large bore reactor coolant system piping,
19 and other large components that are radioactive to a
20 similar degree.

21 Ninety days after we receive the PSDAR, and after
22 certification of permanent cessation of operations and
23 removal of the fuel, Maine Yankee could begin to perform
24 major decommissioning activities without specific NRC
25 approval, using a process described in our Section 50.59

1 of our regulations.

2 Next slide, please.

3 Now that Maine Yankee has submitted the PSDAR, what
4 obligations does the NRC have?

5 The first step, we were required to provide public
6 notice of the receipt of the PSDAR, and our method of
7 doing that is the Federal Register. And we also have to
8 make that PSDAR available to the public. We're required
9 to hold a public meeting in the vicinity of the plant.
10 And we have to provide an opportunity for written
11 comments.

12 And we did this both by providing an address and a
13 point of contact in the Federal Register, and then also,
14 obviously, we're here to take comments this evening.

15 The NRC staff will determine if the informational
16 requirements of our regulations were satisfied by the
17 PSDAR. If the information provided by the licensee is
18 not consistent with the requirements of our regulation,
19 then the NRC staff will require the licensee to amend
20 their submittal prior to beginning major decommissioning
21 activities.

22 If the PSDAR provides the required information, then
23 we'll document this conclusion in a memorandum that will
24 be placed on the docket, and, therefore, will be
25 available to the public.

1 We have not yet determined whether the PSDAR
2 submitted for Maine Yankee satisfies the informational
3 requirements. And, in part, that's dependent upon the
4 comments that you'll provide this evening.

5 We will consider oral and written comments received
6 from members of the public. And we plan to address all
7 the public comments pertaining to the PSDAR in a
8 memorandum that we'll place on the docket for the
9 facility and will be available to the public.

10 And that means also that we'll have a sign-up list,
11 and people who specifically want to be on distribution
12 will be able to receive that; although it will also be
13 available at the local public document room at the
14 Wiscasset Public Library.

15 So, to summarize, we provide notice of receipt of
16 the PSDAR and we hold a public meeting in the vicinity
17 of the plant. Then we determine if the requirements of
18 the regulations have been met, and, if so, we document
19 that conclusion. And we're obligated to respond to
20 public comments. And, in the meantime, the staff is
21 also preparing for inspections and the necessary
22 oversight of the decommissioning of the facility.

23 Next slide, please.

24 After completion of the activities associated with
25 the PSDAR, the licensee could begin decommissioning in

1 earnest. Many of the activities conducted during
2 decommissioning are similar to actions taken at
3 operating units; however, because of the nonoperating
4 status of the facility, the consequences of events or
5 accidents during decommissioning are greatly reduced.
6 Nonetheless, our regulations impose additional
7 requirements on licensee activities during
8 decommissioning.

9 The licensee is prohibited from performing any
10 decommissioning activity that would foreclose the
11 release of the site to unrestricted use, result in
12 significant environmental impacts they haven't already
13 evaluated, or result in there no longer being reasonable
14 assurance that adequate funds will be available for
15 decommissioning.

16 So, in practical terms, these limitations compel
17 Maine Yankee, or any given licensee, to evaluate the
18 radiological, environmental and financial impacts of
19 their proposed actions.

20 Next slide, please.

21 No later than two years before the planned
22 termination of the license, they must submit a license
23 termination plan.

24 So the plan will include the items identified on the
25 screen:

1 A radiological site characterization; identification
2 of remaining activities; plans for how they intend to
3 remediate the site; detailed plans for their final
4 radiation survey; a description of the end use of the
5 site; again, an updated site-specific estimate of
6 remaining decommissioning costs; and a supplement to the
7 environmental report describing any new information or
8 significant environmental impacts or changes that could
9 be associated with their activities.

10 And, similar to the PSDAR, to keep the public in the
11 loop, we'll provide a notice of the license termination
12 plan in the Federal Register again, will make it
13 available for public comment. And, in this case, we
14 offer an opportunity for a hearing on the plan. We'll
15 also hold a public meeting in the vicinity of the site.
16 And we would expect the licensee, Maine Yankee, to
17 describe the license termination plan to the public.
18 We'll describe the activities that remain for us that
19 are associated with the license termination, and again
20 provide the public an opportunity to understand the
21 process and to ask questions and provide comments.

22 May we have the next slide, please.

23 NRC approval of the license termination plan will be
24 by a license amendment which would authorize
25 implementation of the license termination plan.

1 As I said, the public is offered an opportunity for
2 a hearing during this portion of the decommissioning
3 process.

4 Following approval of the plan, the licensee then
5 completes site cleanup and performs the final site
6 radiation survey. And we would continue oversight
7 during the entire process.

8 The Commission will only terminate the license if it
9 determines that the decontamination, dismantlement and
10 site remediation activities have been performed in
11 accordance with the approved plan and that that final,
12 that terminal radiation survey and the associated
13 documentation would demonstrate that any remaining
14 structures and facilities on the site are suitable for
15 release.

16 I'd like to now say a few words about our inspection
17 during the decommissioning. As I noted, we'll continue
18 to provide oversight during the decontamination and the
19 dismantlement. At least for the next year, this
20 oversight will include the presence of the senior
21 resident inspector, Mr. Rick Rasmussen, who will be
22 overseeing the decommissioning on a day-to-day basis.
23 We also have an inspection program that uses inspectors
24 from Region I, as well as from headquarters.

25 We have a core program of inspections that involve

1 facility management, decommissioning support activities,
2 spent fuel safety, and radiological safety. So they
3 will be routinely inspected and form the basis for our
4 core inspection program.

5 Additionally, regional and headquarters subject
6 matter experts will conduct inspections of major
7 activities.

8 Next slide, please.

9 I think many of you may be familiar with what's
10 happened so far, but since we've had an overview, I'd
11 like to provide some specifics for Maine Yankee and
12 their decommissioning process.

13 As we've already discussed, they've provided their
14 certifications of permanent cessation of operations and
15 permanent removal of fuel on August 7, 1997, and they
16 submitted their PSDAR on August 27, 1997.

17 That imposed the requirement on the NRC to notify
18 the public of result of that document, and we published
19 a Federal Register notice on September 19. And also,
20 just as Maine Yankee has put this on their web site, the
21 Maine Yankee PSDAR is on the NRC web site as well.

22 We're conducting this meeting this evening to
23 receive your comments. For those questions that we are
24 unable to answer this evening and to address your
25 comments, we will document our response in a memorandum

1 that will be placed on the Maine Yankee docket and will,
2 therefore, be available at the Maine Yankee local public
3 document room at the Wiscasset Public Library.

4 Our response will also be provided to anybody here
5 this evening who requests to be on our distribution list
6 for this subject. You can put your name on one of the
7 sign-up lists at the back of the room.

8 Maine Yankee is restricted from conducting any major
9 decommissioning activities until November 25th, 90 days
10 from the date it submitted the PSDAR. And, as they
11 pointed out, even though the regulations allow them to
12 begin major decommissioning activities as early as later
13 this month, they've stated their intentions to wait or
14 postpone dismantlement until September of 1998.

15 They plan to submit their license termination plan
16 in April, 2003, to conduct site surveys to help them
17 terminate the license in the last quarter of 2004, and
18 their goal is to terminate the license in April of 2005.

19 During this entire process, Maine Yankee will
20 continue to be subject to the NRC regulations, and we
21 will provide regulatory oversight of the facility and
22 will conduct both headquarters and regional-based
23 inspections of the plant to verify that Maine Yankee is,
24 in fact, conducting decommissioning in a safe manner.

25 I want to repeat that I'm one of many NRC staff

1 members involved in the oversight of Maine Yankee's
2 decommissioning. The other staff members here will also
3 be overseeing their activities. And although several of
4 us are here tonight to answer your questions and to
5 address your comments, your questions are always
6 welcome. Therefore, could I have the next slide?

7 So, for your information, and it's included in the
8 packet, the handout of the view-graphs, I've provided
9 the mailing address, phone number, fax number, and
10 electronic mail address for myself and Rick Rasmussen,
11 and I have the headquarters toll-free number up under my
12 name, if you prefer to make an 800 call.

13 This concludes our presentation, and I'd like to
14 return the floor to Senator KilKelly and to your
15 questions and comments.

16 Thank you for your patience this evening and for
17 your attention.

18 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you, Mike.

19 If we could have the folks from Maine Yankee come up
20 and sit at that table and the folks from the NRC over
21 here, we'll take questions.

22 And, as I stated before, there will be an
23 opportunity for comment, so if we could have this first
24 time just for questions. And I would ask again that
25 when you come to the microphone to ask your questions,

1 so that everyone can hear, and state your name, spell
2 your last name, where you're from, and if you're
3 representing an organization.

4 Yes.

5 KRIS CHRISTINE: I have several questions. Can you
6 hear me?

7 SEN. KILKELLY: No.

8 MS. CHRISTINE: Would you like me to speak louder?

9 SEN. KILKELLY: See if the microphone is on. I
10 think maybe it's not on yet.

11 MS. CHRISTINE: There's no button. Oh, here it is.

12 SEN. KILKELLY: Yes.

13 MS. CHRISTINE: My name is Kris Christine. First
14 name is spelled K-R-I-S, last name is C-H-R-I-S-T-I-N-E.
15 I'm from Alna, and I represent my family.

16 I have some questions. Mr. Meisner, you mentioned
17 that you're redesigning the spent fuel pool. You're
18 going to create a nuclear island isolated from -- to
19 isolate the pool from plant activities. Are you
20 actually physically moving the fuel?

21 MR. MEISNER: Oh, no.

22 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. Well, I kind of wondered --

23 MR. MEISNER: No, the fuel isn't moved. What we do
24 is break some of the connections, electrical and
25 otherwise, with the rest of the facility and provide

1 additional means, say, for cooling.

2 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. So it will still be in a wet
3 storage?

4 MR. MEISNER: Yes. The fuel doesn't move.

5 MS. CHRISTINE: Well, I wondered, because you also
6 mentioned the possibilities of repowering the plant and
7 that natural gas is one of the possibilities. And it's
8 my understanding that NRC will require the spent fuel
9 pool, whether it's in wet storage or in dry-cask
10 storage, to be a half-mile -- a minimum of a half-mile
11 away from any gas-fired turbines. So I wondered if you
12 were actually physically moving the fuel in anticipation
13 of a possible switch to repowering the plant with
14 natural gas.

15 MR. MEISNER: That's one of the advantages of going
16 to a dry-cask facility, is you can not only site that
17 facility somewhat remote from where the fuel pool is
18 now, but you can also go ahead and decommission the
19 spent fuel pool itself. So, as far as a half-mile,
20 maybe the NRC can correct me, but --

21 MS. CHRISTINE: Mr. Pittiglio, at the last meeting,
22 came up to me after the meeting and reassured me that
23 NRC -- if Maine Yankee were repowered with natural gas,
24 that the NRC would require the spent fuel, no matter how
25 it was being stored, in wet storage or in dry storage,

1 that it would have to be a half-mile away from any
2 gas-fired turbine.

3 MR. MEISNER: Well, I think -- let me just answer
4 that. What will have to be done, just like any other
5 design change, is we'll have to evaluate all the
6 potential effects of any new facility, part of which
7 would be the explosive effects of the natural gasline.
8 And whether that's a half-mile, a mile, or four-tenths
9 of a mile, it depends on doing those analyses.

10 MS. CHRISTINE: Uh-huh.

11 MR. MEISNER: In some situations, a half-mile may
12 not be enough. In other situations, it may be more than
13 enough. I don't think there's any firm distance.

14 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. Along the same lines, John
15 Zwolinski of the NRC staff, for those who don't know,
16 recently confirmed that Connecticut Yankee will perform
17 an analysis of the radiological consequences from a loss
18 of water inventory from their spent fuel pool, and I was
19 wondering if Maine Yankee was planning on doing the same
20 kind of analysis?

21 MR. MEISNER: In fact, I only touched on it briefly
22 when I spoke, but I'd like to invite you all to the next
23 Community Advisory Panel meeting, because we're going to
24 go through those analyses in some detail.

25 MS. CHRISTINE: So you have done one on the

1 radiological consequences --

2 MR. MEISNER: It's in the process. We don't have
3 the final results yet.

4 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay.

5 MR. MEISNER: We expect those in mid-November.

6 MS. CHRISTINE: Another question I have --

7 MR. MEISNER: But it's only one of many analyses
8 that are being done.

9 MS. CHRISTINE: On the spent fuel pool?

10 MR. MEISNER: Yes.

11 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. Also, once you start active
12 decommissioning next year, is that a going to be a
13 process that's taking place seven days a week, 24 hours
14 a day? I know that during the restart readiness process
15 that there was work going on 24 hours a day, seven days
16 a week, at the plant. Is that same level of activity
17 going to be taking place next year, when you actively
18 start decommissioning the plant?

19 MR. MEISNER: That will depend in large measure on
20 the types of work plans that are proposed by the
21 potential decommissioning vendors. We'll be better able
22 to answer that next year.

23 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. And you will have on site the
24 one NRC resident, Mr. Rasmussen, who will be working, I
25 assume, a 40-hour week. Will that change if there's

1 activity going on seven days a week, 24 hours a day?

2 MR. MEISNER: I think that's a question for the NRC.

3 MS. CHRISTINE: For the NRC. Will that change if,
4 during the decommissioning process, there is work going
5 on 24 hours a day, seven days a week, at Maine Yankee,
6 which would be a total of 168 hours of work a week.
7 And, obviously, Mr. Rasmussen, I assume, works a 40-hour
8 week. And you only have one resident inspector. That
9 would mean there is only NRC oversight for a quarter of
10 the time.

11 Will that be changed and will you add another
12 resident inspector if, in fact, there are that many
13 hours of decommissioning activity going on?

14 MR. BELLAMY: You brought up a number of issues in
15 that question.

16 First, Mr. Rasmussen regularly works more than 40
17 hours a week. He is here a lot of extra hours.

18 MS. CHRISTINE: Probably not 168, though.

19 MR. BELLAMY: Clearly not 168.

20 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay.

21 MR. BELLAMY: We are continuing to evaluate what the
22 staffing level will be required during the
23 decommissioning process here. We will take a continual
24 look at the activities that are going on and we'll make
25 sure that there's appropriate NRC oversight and coverage

1 during the high points of activity.

2 If there is a major activity ongoing and Maine
3 Yankee decides that they will have significant activity
4 for seven days a week, 24 hours a day, then at least for
5 some short periods of that time I will ensure that there
6 is that same amount of coverage.

7 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay.

8 MR. BELLAMY: I'm not committing that there will be
9 another resident inspector here, because I have a number
10 of staff available to me both in the Region I office and
11 Dr. Weiss's staff in headquarters will also be available
12 to provide the necessary coverage.

13 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. Also, Maine Yankee was in the
14 process of repairing the 90% of its fire penetration
15 seals that will allow the plant to resume operation, and
16 then the work was suspended. Does Maine Yankee
17 currently have adequate fire penetration seals in place
18 that will be needed during decommissioning? Because I
19 know that a lot of volatile compounds, like chemicals,
20 propane, acetylene, etc., and other explosive materials
21 are used during the decommissioning process. So, is
22 that something that has been adequately corrected for
23 the decommissioning process?

24 MR. MEISNER: We're required to continue to maintain
25 a fire protection program, albeit to a much reduced

1 scope. And that scope is primarily the spent fuel pool.

2 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. So does that answer --

3 MR. MEISNER: As you indicated, you know, we're
4 replacing a large number of seals. Most of those seals
5 needn't be replaced now, because they're not associated
6 with the spent fuel pool.

7 MS. CHRISTINE: Are the ones that are associated
8 with the spent fuel pool adequate at this point?

9 MR. MEISNER: That's my understanding, yes. We've
10 been taking a look at all the programmatic requirements
11 and how they apply. Like I indicated, similar to the
12 system reclassification, how they apply to the
13 decommissioning environment.

14 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. I have just one last
15 question. Has there been an evaluation done, an
16 analysis on the explosive hazard risk from the materials
17 that are used during decommissioning?

18 MR. MEISNER: That's routinely done anytime we
19 introduce any new material that hasn't previously been
20 evaluated. That's part of our required programs, to do
21 those evaluations.

22 MS. CHRISTINE: Okay. Thank you.

23 SEN. KILKELLY: Yes, the next person with questions,
24 please?

25 MR. BRACK: My name is H. G. Brack, B-R-A-C-K. I'm

1 the editor of RADNET and from the Center for Biological
2 Monitoring in Bar Harbor. And I had a series of
3 questions here relating to the reactor vessel for Mike.

4 It says here low-level waste burial cost here,
5 \$83,000,379. Is that either for South Carolina or for
6 Texas, or either one of those -- the costs are the same,
7 or are you planning to go with one location or the
8 other?

9 MS. LYNCH: The costs in the TLG study that we're
10 using at the FERC are based on South Carolina. At this
11 point, South Carolina is the only site available to
12 Maine Yankee. If the Texas Compact is enacted by the
13 Congress, we will need to supplement our FERC filing and
14 we will be requesting more money, because the Texas
15 facility has a -- has both an access fee and increased
16 costs of shipping and transportation that are not
17 reflected in the current number.

18 MR. BRACK: Okay. In terms of the current number
19 here, does this envision or are you envisioning here the
20 siting of the reactor vessel intact, with the internals,
21 with this particular figure here?

22 MR. MEISNER: That figure assumes segmenting, I
23 believe. If you look at our PSDAR, that's one of the
24 issues we addressed, is cutting up the greater than
25 Class C waste, such as the reactor vessel.

1 MR. BRACK: But both your PSDAR and Connecticut
2 Yankee indicate that one of your options would be to
3 site the reactor vessel intact without segmentation.

4 MR. MEISNER: And that fact --

5 MR. BRACK: That's one of the options you're
6 considering.

7 MR. MEISNER: And we're following that very closely.
8 If you look at the Trojan plant in the Northwest, they
9 have a proposal pending before the NRC to do just that.
10 And it's not just the reactor vessel, but it's the
11 reactor vessel internals as well.

12 MR. BRACK: With the internals. So, then, you would
13 be shipping the entire reactor vessel to South Carolina
14 in one unit, if you follow that scenario?

15 MR. MEISNER: If that option is feasible. Now, our
16 plans are to follow closely the interaction between
17 Trojan and the NRC, because it really comes down, in
18 some sense, to a regulatory decision, and that isn't an
19 option that's open to us right now.

20 MR. BRACK: Now, if you do segment the reactor
21 vessel internals, what's the destination for the reactor
22 vessel internals in that scenario?

23 MR. MEISNER: Can somebody help me on that? I
24 believe we --

25 MS. LYNCH: I'll take a crack at some of it. If

1 it's greater than Class C waste, it will remain either
2 in our pool or presumably a dry cask until such time as
3 the Department of Energy can take it. If it's Class A,
4 B or C waste, I understand that South Carolina can take
5 all of it.

6 MR. BRACK: I'll make reference here to the old
7 Maine Yankee reactor vessel inventory, 1987. You may
8 recall, I wrote you a few years ago, because if we look
9 at the greeter than Class C listings here and the 239
10 cubic feet of greater than Class C internals was listed
11 in the old manifest here as going out off-site in 100
12 shipments to Barnwell for only 239. Now, I wrote you a
13 couple of years ago and asked you, would this be going
14 to Texas mixed with Class A waste. And you said no,
15 they would not. So now you feel that the greater than
16 Class C waste with this segmenting scenario would be
17 disposed of with the spent fuel?

18 MS. LYNCH: We anticipate that the greater than
19 Class C waste, which in the current study is about the
20 same cubic feet -- I can't remember the exact number, if
21 it's 225, 239 -- it's about right --

22 MR. BRACK: Right.

23 MS. LYNCH: -- will remain in the spent fuel pool.

24 MR. BRACK: Will remain in the spent fuel pool?

25 MS. LYNCH: Assuming that's our management plan.

1 MR. BRACK: So, would you put the GTCC wastes into
2 the spent fuel pool, like they did at Yankee Rowe, and
3 have sufficient space in the spent fuel pool?

4 MS. LYNCH: Yes, we do.

5 MR. BRACK: So then, why in the PSDARs for both the
6 Maine Yankee and the Connecticut facility is the option
7 listed for sending it off to South Carolina in one large
8 unit? This is clearly a new paradigm. This would be
9 the first time this method of disposal would be used of
10 any reactor in the United States, if I'm correct. Can
11 you cite any other reactor that would have disposed of a
12 reactor vessel intact in one unit like that?

13 MR. MEISNER: Yes, Yankee Rowe.

14 MR. BRACK: Well, no, Yankee Rowe, I beg to differ
15 with you, the reactor, the GTCC wastes is in the spent
16 fuel pool. Your curic content of the Yankee Rowe
17 reactor vessel that was cited was 4-, 5- or 6,000
18 curies. Are you aware of what the curic content would
19 be of an intact reactor vessel? Can you tell us that?

20 MR. MEISNER: Your question was are we aware of
21 anybody shipping a vessel intact, which I believe was
22 your question.

23 MR. BRACK: Yes.

24 MR. MEISNER: And Yankee Rowe did that last spring.

25 MR. BRACK: But they had first segmented out the

1 GTCC waste, though. They did not include the reactor
2 vessel internals in the South Carolina disposal. It was
3 only the reactor vessel itself. So you would -- the
4 Yankee Rowe vessel, you had taken out, or the licensee
5 there had segmented out the greater than Class C waste
6 before they sent the vessel to South Carolina.

7 This is an important distinction here in terms of
8 what is going on here, because, you know, you list here
9 in your own -- in the Maine Yankee reactor vessel
10 inventory, at two years cooling, you're listing greater
11 than Class C wastes of 4 million curies at two years
12 cooling. This is you're reactor vessel inventory, which
13 is available to anyone through Uldis Vanags' study on
14 radioactive waste in 1992, I believe it was.

15 So Yankee Rowe is not -- is a good example of
16 segmentation. So, at Yankee Rowe you took the GTCC
17 wastes out of the reactor vessel before it went to South
18 Carolina. In the PSDAR for both Connecticut Yankee and
19 Maine Yankee you're putting out the option of sending
20 the vessel to South Carolina for burial with the reactor
21 vessel components intact, including all the GTCC wastes
22 as one option. And I think that's very clear in the
23 PSDAR.

24 MR. MEISNER: You're exactly right. Can I answer?
25 I think your question was did anyone send a vessel

1 intact. Yes, Yankee Rowe did. Is anybody else going to
2 do that? Yes, there is a pending proceeding in the NRC
3 for Trojan.

4 MR. BRACK: Because it seems to me --

5 MR. MEISNER: Is Maine Yankee going to do that?
6 That depends on whether or not that configuration is
7 determined to be greater than Class C waste. If the
8 determination is such that it's not, then that would be
9 the preferred method of disposing of the reactor vessel.

10 MR. BRACK: But in terms of reading the literature
11 here, it's my distinct impression that, in fact, the
12 reactor vessel with the internals intact can be
13 considered greater -- just Class C waste by averaging,
14 for example, in your upper head. If you've got a piece
15 of equipment that's Class A waste, that's 197,000
16 pounds, with only 7 curies. Now, that's one component
17 of the reactor vessel.

18 Now, you go down here and look at the lower core
19 support barrel, and you've got 550,000 curies in 69,000
20 pounds. We take a look at the core shroud. We've got
21 3,169,000 curies in only 37,800 pounds.

22 So, if you average all this together as one reactor
23 vessel with internals intact, then you do have a Class C
24 situation, and presto, you have a new paradigm for
25 decommissioning the reactors in this country.

1 And this is a very important paradigm, because this
2 will be disposal of the reactor vessel with the
3 internals intact as Class C waste. And that is implied
4 in the PSDAR both from your facility and from
5 Connecticut Yankee. So this is a whole new paradigm.
6 If you can pull it off, that would be quite the coup
7 d'etat in terms of cost efficiency for decommissioning.

8 If there is a fudge factor here or some problem down
9 in South Carolina where they change their mind, then it
10 seems to me we have a situation where we've put the cart
11 before the horse, and, in fact, you don't really know
12 whether it's a horse pulling the cart, an ox pulling the
13 cart, or whether you have the no-horse shay here.

14 So this raises a lot of questions, and I do hope
15 you'll have some more meetings with this.

16 So I do have other questions, but perhaps we'll let
17 another --

18 MR. MEISNER: Is that a question? I'd just like to
19 finish up by saying I think I agree with everything
20 you're saying, and you've laid out very well what the
21 regulatory interpretation is that's pending before the
22 NRC.

23 MR. BRACK: Right. This would be a radical change
24 in decommissioning scenarios here if that can be pulled
25 off. The question is, in terms of recipient states,

1 this is extremely liberal of South Carolina to be this
2 generous, and I think all the rate-payers in Maine will
3 certainly appreciate their generosity in accepting this
4 packet.

5 It does weigh 706 tons. Is there any question in
6 terms of the licensee about moving a reactor vessel that
7 weighs 706 tons, shipping it on a barge, I would
8 assume, to Savannah, Georgia, and then by railroad
9 facility?

10 MR. MEISNER: Absolutely. There will be a lot of
11 questions, if the option is available to us. There
12 would have to be a lot of work done.

13 MR. BRACK: I guess my other question, of course, is
14 in terms of this \$83,000,379. You're getting it right
15 down to the dollar here, but we really don't know what
16 the scenario is. So perhaps you'll be able to cut the
17 costs here a little bit if you can pull this off, and
18 maybe you're low-level waste costs will go down a little
19 bit. If you could do the South Carolina scenario there
20 with the vessel intact, do you think that would save
21 some money?

22 MS. LYNCH: I just want to make clear that the
23 scenario in this study is segmentation. It is based on
24 current rates. The study itself is a study for
25 rate-making purposes. It is not a detailed engineering

1 plan at this point. So --

2 MR. BRACK: So we have a cost of decommissioning
3 without detailed engineering?

4 Well, anyway, there certainly will be a lot of
5 questions in the future. Will there be any more
6 meetings at all of this nature a year or two from now?

7 MS. LYNCH: The Community Advisory Panel has been
8 meeting, as we mentioned, monthly. I don't know how
9 often they will continue to meet in the future. That
10 would be up to them. But certainly it's just the kind
11 of forum where we'd like to discuss these issues.

12 MR. BRACK: It seems to me there will be so many
13 questions in the future about these various scenarios
14 that it would be nice to have representatives from both
15 the NRC and the licensee available to answer questions
16 in a public forum. So, I hope that's the case. It
17 doesn't seem like it will be the case, though.

18 Thank you.

19 MS. LYNCH: I'll just say we've been available every
20 month to answer questions in a public forum down in
21 Wiscasset, and we'll be there as long as people want to
22 ask questions.

23 MR. BRACK: Whether there would be a transcript of
24 the questions?

25 SEN. KILKELLY: We have been maintaining a

1 transcript of all questions that have been asked at
2 every meeting that staff have been attending.

3 MR. BRACK: That's good to hear. The Citizens --

4 SEN. KILKELLY: The Citizens. And we have been
5 getting those answered as quickly as possible. And, as
6 they're answered, that information is provided at our
7 meetings.

8 MR. BRACK: And at the future Citizens' meetings
9 will there be a representative of the NRC or the
10 licensee to answer some of these questions?

11 SEN. KILKELLY: There are always people there,
12 licensee folks there. In terms of the NRC, that would
13 be a question for them.

14 MR. BRACK: Okay. Well, thank you very much for
15 letting me speak.

16 SEN. KILKELLY: Others with questions, please,
17 before we start the comment period?

18 Yes?

19 MR. GRAY: Ken Gray from Wiscasset. That's G-R-A-Y,
20 the last name.

21 How much -- what's the cost on a cubic foot basis
22 for disposal of low-level waste in Barnwell, South
23 Carolina?

24 MS. LYNCH: I don't have that number in front of me,
25 but maybe Jamie Mallon can help me.

1 MR. MALLON: Currently Barnwell -- my name is Jamie
2 Mallon. I'm the radiation protection manager at Maine
3 Yankee, and I have responsibility under me for rad
4 waste.

5 Currently, Barnwell charges on a per-pound basis.
6 There are surcharge fees for access to the site, and
7 curie fees as well. So it's difficult to give a single
8 dollar value per pound. It's not on a cubic-foot basis.

9 MR. GRAY: I guess one of my questions would be how
10 does the NRC monitor wastes going out of the plant which
11 actually go to landfills, possibly, or transfer
12 stations, possibly in Wiscasset or wherever? Is there
13 any monitoring system set up so that inadvertently some
14 low-level waste doesn't wind up in a transfer station?

15 MR. BELLAMY: The NRC will not be monitoring every
16 shipment of waste, as you've just specified. What we
17 will do is we will take a random sample. We will verify
18 what the licensee is doing. We will take a look at
19 their program. But basically, it's Maine Yankee's
20 responsibility to verify that any of the waste shipped
21 offsite, specifically that goes to landfill, is
22 basically clean waste and is acceptable for that
23 purpose.

24 MR. GRAY: There's nothing implemented by the State
25 of Maine, or anything, to handle monitoring once it's

1 off the site, itself?

2 SEN. KILKELLY: Is there someone here that can
3 answer?

4 MR. VANAGS: Uldis Vanags, last name V-A-N-A-G-S.
5 I'm representing the Governor's Office.

6 Presently we have a state inspector on-site who
7 works with the Division of Health Engineering. He'll be
8 on-site throughout the entire decommissioning of Maine
9 Yankee. One of his duties will be, and is presently,
10 inspecting and monitoring activities at the site, plus
11 the movement of low-level waste. And that will be
12 another thing we will be looking at also. That's a
13 point that we will be looking at, is movement of any
14 type of waste to any facility, in New Jersey or
15 anywhere.

16 MR. MEISNER: And Jamie, would you like to briefly
17 describe the process?

18 MR. MALLON: My name again, Jamie Mallon. That's
19 M-A-L-L-O-N. I'm the radiation protection manager at
20 Maine Yankee.

21 Currently there are extensive controls on the
22 movement of material from the radiologically controlled
23 side of the plant to the radiologically clean side of
24 the plant. We monitor material moving across that
25 boundary to ensure that any contamination is maintained

1 within the radiologically controlled area. Waste from
2 that area goes to NRC-licensed facilities. Any material
3 that has been cleared across that boundary is
4 radiologically clean. And that's how we control
5 materials fundamentally going to landfills versus a
6 Barnwell.

7 MR. GRAY: How much volume of the radiologically
8 clean is going to be going to landfills? Does anyone
9 have any idea of the volume, percentage of the plant?
10 Anyone know?

11 MR. MEISNER: Well, Jamie, correct me if I'm wrong,
12 but I think for the radiologically clean materials that
13 have been surveyed, we don't anticipate much, if any,
14 material to go offsite. If I misunderstood your
15 question, would you --

16 MR. MALLON: Could you repeat the question?

17 MR. GRAY: Yes. For material that's radiologically
18 clean, has no radioactivity whatsoever, which would be
19 shipped to landfills or to a waste transfer station, do
20 you have any idea of what amount that Maine Yankee will
21 be shipping?

22 MR. MALLON: Are you asking about clean trash or are
23 you asking about in relation to the site?

24 MR. GRAY: Broth.

25 MR. MALLON: Again, Jamie Mallon. For routine

1 trash, I have no idea what volume of material leaves the
2 site.

3 For materials generated during the deconstruction of
4 the facility, those figures are available through, I
5 believe, the TLG study, and I'm not sure if they're
6 quoted in the PSDAR.

7 That level of detail would also be coming later in
8 the detailed decommissioning report that is due in two
9 years, I believe.

10 MR. MEISNER: I want to make sure that we're talking
11 about the same thing here. What Jamie is discussing is
12 the low-level waste.

13 MR. MALLON: Right.

14 MR. MEISNER: The soil. For instance, contaminated
15 soil. That's handled much differently than material
16 that is not contaminated and is free-releasable.

17 Except for returning the site to a green-fielding
18 rating, we have no firm plans to ship off a large amount
19 of soil, if I'm understanding your question. There's no
20 need to do that. Soil that is radiologically clean.

21 MR. GRAY: What I was speaking of are the
22 decontaminated items. Items that have no radioactive
23 point in them at this point, where they would be going.
24 But I was just concerned whether the landfills --
25 anything would be monitored that would be going to

1 landfills. That's my main concern.

2 Thank you.

3 SEN. KILKELLY: All right. Others with questions?

4 Yes?

5 MS. HOLT: Maria Holt, H-O-L-T, Bath.

6 The spent fuel pool has always been of concern to
7 many of the residents. And you speak of analyses being
8 done. Is there any thought to strengthening that
9 building, not just taking care of the seals, that sort
10 of thing. I mean, we have an airport nearby. It may
11 not be as carefully watched over as it has been, in the
12 years to come.

13 It looks to me as though we won't have dry-cask
14 storage for a while. Even if it were decided upon, we
15 might not have them -- it might take a couple of years
16 or maybe longer. So that's a concern.

17 We have the airport nearby, and I just read an
18 article not too long ago that the next phase of
19 earthquakes will be one the East Coast. So I think the
20 strengthening of that pool is a concern. Also the
21 watchdogging of it. There may not be, as you said, as
22 many expert people watching over it.

23 MR. MEISNER: One of the main reasons that we're
24 getting into a redesign of the spent fuel facility is to
25 do just what I think you're talking about, and that's to

1 enhance the reliability of it and decrease the
2 dependence of that facility on the rest of the plant.

3 As far as if you're asking about airplane crashes
4 into the building --

5 MS. HOLT: It could happen. We had one within a
6 mile of the plant.

7 MR. MEISNER: I understand the FAA, I believe,
8 prohibits flights over Maine Yankee for just that
9 reason. I guess that's the extent of my knowledge.

10 MS. HOLT: I was thinking of a stronger roof, that
11 kind of thing. Thank you. It's more like a Quonset hut
12 than I'd like to think.

13 SEN. KILKELLY: Are there others with questions?

14 Yes?

15 MR. KATZ: Hello, my name is Fred Katz. I'm from
16 Massachusetts.

17 SEN. KILKELLY: Could you spell your last name,
18 please?

19 MR. KATZ: K-A-T-Z.

20 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

21 MR. KATZ: And I'm from Rowe, so this is the third
22 meeting of this kind that I've been at.

23 But I would like to revisit the issue of stuff going
24 off the site, because the second of the meetings of this
25 kind that I was at was at Connecticut Yankee, and they

1 discovered there -- I'm not sure how they discovered
2 it -- but unknown quantities of radioactive soil had
3 been distributed throughout the community. In one case,
4 to a place where children were. A day-care center.

5 So that the question I'd ask was, do you think that
6 here in Maine radiological controls can guarantee that
7 this didn't happen? And how, if there is no monitoring
8 of materials going off the site?

9 MR. MEISNER: I think we must have left a
10 misimpression, because there is monitoring of materials
11 before they leave the site.

12 MR. KATZ: Well, I mean, I think that that would be
13 the same answer I would have been given in account. I
14 think that in Connecticut they are, after all, Yankees,
15 just like you are, technologically advanced. But they
16 weren't able to guarantee it. And how are you going to
17 guarantee that it won't happen here, just as it did in
18 Connecticut?

19 And the quantities of contaminated material are
20 still unknown. I mean, they are asking people to report
21 whether they had received contaminated materials. So
22 will there be a survey of the community asking whether
23 any fill had been brought from the reactor into various
24 places in this community?

25 MR. MEISNER: One of the purposes of the site

1 characterization is to understand in great detail where
2 contamination may reside, and whether that's in the
3 soils or within the facility itself, in the buildings.
4 So that we will, on the order of five months, have a
5 very detailed map of where that contamination resides.
6 And we have no intention of taking any material out of
7 the site without knowing the extent to which it may or
8 may not be contaminated.

9 SEN. KILKELLY: We have an answer down here, as
10 well.

11 MR. BELLAMY: The comment that I made earlier that
12 every potential shipment of low-level or clean material
13 that would be shipped off-site would not be surveyed was
14 only meant to indicate that the NRC was not going to
15 survey every one of those shipments. It was not a
16 statement as to what the licensee was going to do.

17 And also, I'd like to comment that yes, it is true
18 that there have been a measurable amount of radioactive
19 material identified off-site at Connecticut Yankee.
20 That has to date only been identified in one location.
21 And the amount of radioactive material that was measured
22 was two to three orders of magnitude below what would be
23 releaseable for unrestricted use based on today's
24 regulatory criteria.

25 SEN. KILKELLY: Yes?

1 MR. MAYHEW: I'm Mike Mayhew from Boothbay Harbor.

2 I'm curious about the fact that the cost of
3 decommissioning, which obviously many people are quite
4 skeptical of your number that you presented today. It
5 is considerably conservative compared to what most
6 people believe the actual cost of decommissioning is.
7 And yet, it is approximately 50% higher than the
8 official number three years ago.

9 My question is does that make you embarrassed from a
10 professional standpoint to come up and straightfaced --
11 I mean, a mustache helps a little bit with a straight
12 face, but can you, in your clear conscience, say three
13 years from now that you won't be off a factor of 50%?
14 I'm giving you 50% more in this new number.

15 Do you honestly believe, in your own professional
16 ability, that you'll be within 50% of your three years
17 from now projection?

18 And in what -- that's one question, and I'll let you
19 answer that before I ask you my next one.

20 MS. LYNCH: I'll answer it, even though I don't have
21 a mustache. I'll try to do it with a straight face.

22 The last study that we did in 1993 determined that
23 it would cost \$316 million in 1993 dollars to
24 decommission the plant. That study, if you inflate to
25 1997 dollars, would translate to \$377 million. The

1 numbers that I put up earlier -- and I didn't
2 unfortunately bring a copy with me -- but I think it was
3 \$380 million to decommission, dismantle the plant and
4 restore the site. There's another -- I was right, \$380
5 million. There's another \$128 million included, in
6 addition, which is directly the cost of the federal
7 government's failure to take the waste.

8 So, I'd like to point out that the Maine Yankee
9 study is not that different than the one that we did in
10 1993. And these numbers will change, I know that,
11 because we haven't done the site characterization. But
12 it is a good, solid estimate, and I have a high degree
13 of confidence in it. And it was done by the person
14 who's probably the most highly regarded expert in this
15 area and the nation.

16 So, I think, just to put it in perspective, it is
17 very close to the '93 numbers, absent the government's
18 nonperformance. And those were numbers that we didn't
19 look at in 1993. We did not anticipate this additional
20 length of storage and the need for dry casks.

21 MR. MAYHEW: I mean, I think a lot of the
22 credibility has to do with the fact that you didn't
23 anticipate the DOE having problems taking your waste.

24 But my other -- my other question has to do with the
25 fact, on your bullets on your decommissioning mission,

1 the cost-effective -- cost-effectively is your second
2 bullet. Are we talking life-cycle costs? What is
3 cost-effective. And what is -- are you looking at
4 societal costs? And I think that is extremely important
5 in a community, in a state that is so heavily dependent
6 on tourist money, on the marine aquaculture industry,
7 and everything that's associated with this.

8 Cost-effectively, to me, means that you had better
9 be looking at the absolute safest -- whatever the first
10 cost, because the life-cycle cost is going to be the
11 lowest and your risk is going to be the lowest.

12 And you may -- and that's what I'm wondering.
13 Cost-effectively, what does that mean?

14 MS. LYNCH: Those bullets in our mission was to
15 decommission the plant safely and cost-effectively. For
16 Maine Yankee, that means first and foremost safety.
17 Secondly, cost-effectively.

18 Very simply, we don't want to waste money.

19 MR. MAYHEW: Are you looking at life-cycle costs,
20 are you looking at societal costs?

21 MS. LYNCH: We are looking, very simply, in layman's
22 terms, cost-effectively, not wasting money.

23 If I can finish answering the question, it is in
24 Maine Yankee's interest to do the best possible job we
25 can, because the NRC will not permit a release of the

1 site, will not relieve us of our financial obligations,
2 until we clean it up. So that's what we mean.

3 It's not in fancy economist terms, but simply in
4 plain-spoken do the best job you can for the least
5 amount of money, with safety as your highest priority.

6 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

7 What we'd like to do now is take a short break in
8 order to move the projector. We'll take a break for
9 about five minutes, and then we'll be back for comments.

10 (Recess.)

11 SEN. KILKELLY: Before we get into the comment
12 period, just to remind people, written comments are
13 being accepted. You don't have to present them orally.
14 There will be a limit of approximately five minutes for
15 each presenter, and I'll give you a one-minute warning
16 so that everybody will have a chance too speak. And
17 there is a list of people that have signed up to speak.

18 First, I'd like to recognize Don Hudson. Don, you
19 had a question that you wanted to ask?

20 MR. HUDSON: My name is Don Hudson, H-U-D-S-O-N. I
21 live in Arrowsic, Maine.

22 The question I have is really asking -- it's a point
23 of clarification. When we talk about terminating a
24 license, we're talking about terminating a power
25 license. Could someone just give me a capsule of the

1 license that will be in place so long as there are fuel
2 rods on the site, which may be as long as 18 years. At
3 least projected now to be at least 18 years after the
4 last of the materials other than those have been
5 removed?

6 MR. WEBB: Right now, as you indicated, Maine Yankee
7 has what we've referred to as a Part 50 license, or a
8 reactor license. When they move the fuel into an
9 independent spent-fuel storage installation, if that's
10 what they choose to do, we have a separate section of
11 the regulations called Part 72. It's an independent
12 spent-fuel storage installation, and it describes many
13 of the same types of programs -- well, similar programs
14 for reactors; that is, the security, emergency planning,
15 quality assurance, and various other regulatory
16 requirements that are imposed upon them.

17 And again, it's an NRC license that they would
18 retain until such time as the fuel had been moved off
19 the site, and essentially is when the Department of
20 Energy took responsibility for that -- or took ownership
21 for that fuel.

22 SEN. KILKELLY: Okay. From the sign-in sheet, the
23 first speaker is John Chester from Wiscasset.

24 MR. CHESTER: Good evening, ladies and gentlemen.
25 My name is John Chester, C-H-E-S-T-E-R. I'm a resident

1 of Wiscasset, have been for 45 years.

2 Madam Chairperson, the Honorable State Senator Marge
3 Kilkelly, I ask that you entertain taking my paper here
4 tonight later and have it entered into the official
5 record of the Nuclear Regulatory Commission notes for
6 the evening.

7 I thought that you ought to hear just a little bit
8 about a Community Advisory Panel member; who is this
9 person, she or he, who makes up our Community Advisory
10 Panel with Maine Yankee.

11 It's a little bit different tonight. It's a little
12 bit more informative, of the actual people who have the
13 responsibility of our town. Our town here is a little
14 over 3,500 people, 1,700 homes. My children, my four
15 young children graduated from this school right here. I
16 was a proud dad. My wife's a registered nurse. And I'm
17 part of this community by the very flesh and blood of
18 the town here.

19 I love my State of Maine and I like this town, or I
20 wouldn't be living here. I like the clam-diggers, the
21 worm-diggers, the lawyers, the educators, the John Doe
22 on the street.

23 I'm not an expert in anything. I'm a knowledgeable
24 person, well read. I've had 37 years in safety, and I
25 was very pleased to spend 21 of those years with the

1 Maine State Police, and that and a nickel will get you a
2 cup of coffee.

3 I've spent quite a few years as an occupational
4 safety and health specialist and a radiation safety
5 officer at Brunswick Naval Air Station. My work at
6 Brunswick Naval Air Station in safety and health took me
7 to bases in Portugal, Central America, and on the
8 Atlantic coastal areas.

9 An expert is only a person who thinks he knows more
10 than others. My secret to success and life, I guess, is
11 I'm willing to listen and learn.

12 I came down here to this Maine Yankee group with an
13 open mind, willing to listen to these folks and see what
14 they had to say. I'm interested in not having any
15 serious accident occur in my town and have the folks
16 injured here.

17 I call an ace an ace when I see it, and I don't hide
18 a damn thing, and I don't intend to.

19 For the past two months the Maine Community Advisory
20 Panel, of which I a member, has been meeting with the
21 Maine Yankee administrators and technical support staff
22 members to do what? To establish an enhance open
23 communications, public involvement, and obtain training
24 and education on Maine Yankee decommissioning issues.

25 We have listened to citizen comments and have been

1 given excellent instruction in that two months period of
2 time, and information on the planned process of the
3 Post-Shutdown Decommissioning Activity Report.

4 I think it's an education. You ought to see my
5 house. The dining room is loaded with manuals and
6 papers and documents, and I study every blasted one of
7 them. I study them and read them and underline them in
8 yellow, and try to become familiar with the serious
9 parts of this issue. I take the Community Advisory
10 Council very, very seriously.

11 During this time period, the Maine Yankee staff
12 provided panel members with a huge amount of documents
13 and technical information covering a wide area of
14 activities, both directly and associated with the
15 planned ongoing decommissioning functionings at Maine
16 Yankee. They have provided me and my fellow members
17 with a clear overview of the full spectrum of operations
18 that is most informative and educational.

19 Maine Yankee takes the time and effort to answer
20 citizens and panel members' questions and concerns in an
21 honest, expedient approach. They encourage panel
22 participation and public comment.

23 I find the Maine Yankee Citizen Advisory Panel, CAP,
24 to be highly motivated. It's an interested, harmonious
25 group. They're really trying to do a good job on the

1 decommissioning.

2 The panel has benefitted from the outstanding
3 leadership of our chairperson, State Senator Marge
4 Kilkelly, a nuts and bolts person, right on the street.
5 She knows what's going on and she'll speak up and be
6 fair to all participants that meet before our committee.

7 Recognizing the fact that in the State of Maine in
8 the past 40 years there are approximately 200 persons a
9 year killed on Maine highways. That's 8,000 people.
10 That's a small community wiped out. I don't want one
11 person hurt or seriously injured at Maine Yankee during
12 this decommissioning process. I want it to be a safe,
13 economical, and gosh darn good decommissioning.

14 And I think it can be if we have the patience and
15 tolerance to listen to our fellow people that we work
16 with every day, and try to do our best.

17 I am proud to be a member of the Maine Yankee
18 Citizen Advisory Panel. It has been beneficial to all
19 of us, including Maine Yankee, Wiscasset residents, and
20 the surrounding towns. I am sure that the
21 decommissioning project can be carried out safely and
22 successfully to the benefit of all concerned.

23 I thank you for your attention and time.

24 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you, John.

25 All right, the next speaker is H. Brack. I

1 apologize if I don't get names right.

2 MR. BRACK: Yes, H. G. Brack. And I just have a few
3 more questions in regards to what I was speaking of
4 before.

5 In looking at the Maine Yankee reactor vessel
6 inventory here, we have these two options, site the
7 reactor vessel with the internals intact or segment out
8 the internals. And just for the record, the reactor
9 vessel inventory which Uldis published in 1992 in his
10 study for radioactive wastes from a TLG decommissioning
11 report that was given to the licensee, your greater than
12 Class C wastes weigh 50 tons.

13 So, if you segment out the greater than Class C
14 wastes in the decommissioning scenario, that will leave
15 a reactor vessel package for South Carolina running
16 around 656 tons. And again, looking at the reactor
17 vessel inventory here, the Class C wastes run around
18 120,000 curies in the reactor vessel and some of the
19 components.

20 Now, I'm not clear whether something like the
21 thermal shields, which is listed here as Class C waste,
22 would that be segmented out, too? That's 93,000 curies.
23 And maybe that would explain the difference between the
24 Yankee Rowe figures here that Debbie Katz has brought,
25 where it was about 4,500 curies when they sited the

1 vessel. I would assume, then, they must have segmented
2 out the thermal shields and also, perhaps, the fuel
3 alignment plate, which runs at Maine Yankee, 14,382
4 curies. And this is at two years cooling.

5 So, in terms of all this material here that we're
6 dealing with, we often see that the low-level wastes are
7 discussed in the press as boots and gloves, and this
8 sort of thing, when, in fact, when we take a look at
9 what might be going to Barnwell or to Texas, the Class C
10 wastes are running into the 100,000 curies or 120,000
11 curies here, whether they're in the reactor vessel or
12 whether they're transported separately.

13 Now, in corresponding with Mary Ann Lynch several
14 years ago about using Texas to accept these 100
15 shipments of greater than Class C waste, as it was
16 listed here in this old 1987 inventory, she indicated to
17 me that no, they would not take Class C wastes --
18 greater than Class C wastes in this format.

19 And this old format, I might remind everyone at this
20 meeting, was to segment out these -- the lowest core
21 support barrel, the core shroud and the support plate,
22 and then to cut them up and divide them into 100
23 shipments. I would assume they were mixed with Class A
24 waste to meet the transport regulations, and so forth.

25 So this is no longer a possibility in Texas.

1 However, we do have South Carolina here, where it is a
2 possibility. But I would point out that this Barnwell
3 facility really exists at the pleasure of the state
4 legislature in South Carolina. Apparently, the last
5 time it was voted in was only by two votes.

6 So it strikes me -- I'd just like to make the
7 comment that the South Carolina facility is certainly
8 the Achilles heel here of the decommissioning process.

9 If South Carolina doesn't pan out here and is not
10 available to receive the reactor vessel in its entirety
11 or with the reactor internals segmented out, then I
12 think that most of your cost estimates are going to go
13 by the board here and we'll have a much greater delay.

14 Because it seems to me that the Texas facility, I
15 think, which is now obsolete, wouldn't, first of all,
16 have the amount of cubic footage.

17 Isn't there a limitation on Texas of 150,000 cubic
18 feet? Is that right, Steve? At the low-level waste
19 site in Texas? The Compact will only allow 150,000
20 cubic feet?

21 SEN. KILKELLY: We're not going to be able to do
22 questions back and forth that way. If you have a
23 question, then we'll try to get it answered. But the
24 transcription --

25 MR. BRACK: Okay. Well, I'd just like to raise that

1 question. But the Texas Compact may not answer your
2 needs to get rid of all of the wastes here that would be
3 generated in the decommissioning process, and certainly
4 not the GTCC wastes.

5 I'm impressed by the fact that your low costs
6 here -- and I consider \$508 million a low figure --
7 would include segmenting out the GTCC wastes, and then
8 disposing of that with the spent fuel. Presumably
9 you'll have to buy a few more dry casks.

10 And I also have another question about the dry cask
11 scenario. Is there a difference between just a dry cask
12 and the multi-purpose canister that would have the
13 overpack. Isn't it a little bit more expensive for a
14 multi-purpose canister? But then again, isn't the
15 multi-purpose canister the ideal piece of equipment to
16 use for your independent spent-fuel storage
17 installation, so then it would be available to -- you'd
18 put it into your parking lot for a few years and then
19 ship it right out without changing your -- changing your
20 containment for the spent fuel.

21 And it seemed to me that a while back the estimates
22 were running about \$800,000 for MPC unit, and you were
23 going to need 100 of them. Now you'll need less because
24 you've closed early.

25 So, I'm not really clear on how accurate these cost

1 estimates are that you've given out tonight. But, on
2 the other hand, we'll have a decade or so to look at it
3 and see how it comes out.

4 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you very much.

5 The next person on the list is Debbie Katz.

6 MS. KATZ: Hi. My name is Debbie Katz. I think a
7 number of the people from the NRC know me and have seen
8 me around, but a lot of the people around here don't
9 know me. I'm from Rowe, Massachusetts, and I'm the
10 president of the Citizens Awareness Network.

11 We are a grass-roots organization of approximately
12 1,200 people. We're all volunteers. We have about 45
13 volunteers, and we're in Connecticut, Massachusetts,
14 Vermont and New Hampshire.

15 And I'm here to tell a cautionary tail, because our
16 community went through the decommissioning that you're
17 about to get. And we called that decommissioning dirty,
18 cheap and illegal. And we took the NRC to court over
19 this decommissioning, and the NRC was found to be
20 arbitrary, capricious and utterly irrational in allowing
21 the reactor in Rowe to decommission.

22 And we believe, in fact, that this reactor will be
23 decommissioned under an arbitrary, capricious and
24 irrational rule, which is dangerous to the public and to
25 the workers and to the environment.

1 Now, why shouldn't they just strip the site and get
2 everything out of here and make it easy on all of us? I
3 live four miles from the Rowe reactor. I have two
4 children. I have good reason to want all of that waste
5 out of my community.

6 We have an epidemic of disease in our community that
7 is, in fact, related to the reactor dumping in our river
8 for 31 years. And if there's enough time, I may get to
9 that. But we have statistical significance in breast
10 cancer, non-Hodgkins lymphoma, we have a tenfold
11 increase in Down's syndrome.

12 So my concern is to come here to talk about this for
13 very serious reasons, not just to make it hard on
14 anyone.

15 We believe that the NRC has to keep control of
16 decommissioning. And, in fact, what they've set up with
17 this with this new rule is a situation in which they
18 leave it up to the reactor to monitor itself. And we
19 believed at Rowe, which was one of the best run reactors
20 in the country, it didn't work out and was a bad idea.
21 And at Maine Yankee and Connecticut, which are not the
22 best run reactors in the country, this becomes an even
23 more dangerous situation in which reactors will be, in
24 fact, in charge of determining how effective a job they
25 are doing.

1 We are grateful that the NRC has decided, in fact,
2 to keep a resident NRC inspector on-site.

3 One of our concerns in this process is that what the
4 NRC has done is make it impossible for people to get a
5 hearing on the decommissioning process. Now, they have
6 meetings like this, one or two, and then they go ahead
7 and they let the reactor do what it wants. And they do
8 set up a decommissioning board now at different reactor
9 sites. But the ability for the citizens to actually
10 question what takes place and have a cross-examination
11 and be able to look at the records of the utility has
12 now been barred and is impossible for citizens to do
13 ever again if this rule is maintained.

14 One of the things that we found, in fact, because we
15 won that lawsuit, and the NRC was, in fact, forced to
16 give us a hearing or go through the process of giving us
17 a hearing, was how much workers were exposed during
18 decommissioning; how dangerous, in fact, the process
19 was; and how unnecessary and experimental some of what
20 took place was.

21 One of the things that Mr. -- I think it's
22 Mr. Brack, was raising about the issue of what to do
23 with the internals is a very serious issue in terms of
24 worker exposure; because what's said again and again is
25 that decommissioning is no big deal. And yet, the most

1 important thing in decommissioning is radiological
2 control. Radiological control. Because it all involves
3 exposure to workers.

4 And the issue of what took place at Rowe was, in
5 fact, the cutting up of a million curie baffle in which
6 workers were unnecessarily exposed, the containment
7 sphere had to be repeatedly evacuated, hot particles
8 were released throughout the reactor. And all of this
9 was unnecessary, because if it had stayed on-site for 30
10 years, the amount of radioactive waste that would have
11 had to be taken away from the site would have been
12 decreased by one order of magnitude; from 140,000 curies
13 to 14,000 curies. That's a very big difference. It
14 minimizes exposure to workers and the public.

15 The whole issue of questioning this is terribly
16 important.

17 I want to leave with one small note, which is I have
18 gone to Barnwell, South Carolina. And I want you to
19 understand people in South Carolina, outside of that
20 small community that is too intimidated to talk about
21 it, don't want your waste. They have a leak of tritium
22 on-site that is making its way down to the single-source
23 aquifer for the site, and the cutting edge of waste
24 technology in America is to dump it in a lined or
25 unlined pit.

1 Thank you.

2 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you. The next speaker is
3 Frederick Katz.

4 MR. KATZ: I'll pass.

5 SEN. KILKELLY: Okay. The next speaker is Joe
6 Grant.

7 MR. GRANT: Good evening. I'm Joe Grant, G-R-A-N-T.
8 I'm from Wiscasset, and I'm representing myself and my
9 family, and I'd like to thank the citizens of Wiscasset
10 and the rate-payers and citizens of Maine.

11 I live very near the plant, less than a mile from
12 the plant, with my wife and five-year-old daughter. I
13 can see it from my home.

14 I also work at Maine Yankee, but I'm not here
15 representing Maine Yankee. I'm representing myself.
16 I've lived in Maine for many, many years before Maine
17 Yankee came here, and I hope to live here many, many
18 years afterwards.

19 To me, one of the paramount concerns of
20 decommissioning is safety and, of course, efficiency.
21 And I've done a little research on safety. And you try
22 to quantify what real ask is. And one of the things I
23 did, I went on the Internet and I looked up deaths. I
24 found that 86,000 people died from vehicle deaths in the
25 United States every year, 12,000 died from falls, 4,000

1 died from fires, 3,500 people drowned, 1,400 died from
2 bicycle accidents, we had 570 train deaths, we had 162
3 lightning deaths. I couldn't find nuclear power in
4 there at all.

5 I took a look at the environmental statistics and
6 found that we had 2,300 deaths in three Maine cities per
7 year due to air pollution.

8 So, what we're really talking about, in essence, is
9 real mothers and fathers, sons and daughters dying. But
10 I still couldn't find anything under nuclear power.

11 So I looked at the WASH-1400 Reactor Safety Study.
12 It's also known as the Rasmussen Report. It's a
13 comprehensive, well-known report. It's quite available.
14 And to look at the kind of risk, I found that compared
15 to the risk of an operating nuclear power plant, I have
16 10,000 times as much risk of air crashes, 10,000 times
17 as much risk as dying in a fire, 10,000 times the risk
18 of dying in a hurricane or a natural disaster, such as
19 an earthquake. I have 1,000 times more risk in getting
20 hit by an airplane while I'm standing on the ground.

21 The only thing I could find in the WASH Report that
22 was roughly comparable to the risk of death due to a
23 nuclear reactor was getting hit by a meteorite.

24 Well, I looked at our operating. We used to operate
25 at 2700 MWt, which is about 3.6 million horsepower, and

1 now we're down to just over 1 MWt. So we've had a huge
2 reduction in risk just due to the fact that fuel has
3 decayed off, we've lost most of the radionuclides, we
4 don't have much energy to get rid of.

5 So now I'm looking at a risk to myself and my family
6 probably of 100 times greater of getting hit by a
7 meteorite. So I'm pretty satisfied with that.

8 So, then let's talk about decommissioning. You
9 know, I am convinced, as a neighbor of the plant, that
10 the company is really committed to a safe and effective
11 decommissioning. Maine Yankee, we still are subject to
12 all of the rules and regulations of the NRC. And these
13 buys are not going to back off. And, as a neighbor, I
14 expect them to hold us to the high standard they've
15 always held us to.

16 Second, Maine Yankee has a strong management team,
17 and it's still run by Entergy. And we are talking a
18 different group there now. And they will be here at
19 least for a certain amount of time. And these guys are
20 doing a good job.

21 What I see, as an employee, is we're still committed
22 to improving our programs and our management. We've put
23 some new programs together: management development
24 programs; a new appraisal program; we're looking at
25 improving some of our process; we're putting through

1 quality action teams, which is an Entergy idea; we're
2 going to improve our corrective action program; our
3 scheduling process; and budgeting. All of this is going
4 to help us have a safer decommissioning.

5 In closing, it is essential that all these groups
6 work together to make decommissioning safe and
7 efficient. I hope there is real honesty in the process.
8 It would be a great service to the rate-payers and the
9 citizens of Maine to get this site restored as safely
10 and quickly as possible.

11 Thank you.

12 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

13 The next speaker is -- I'm sorry, it's either Jen or
14 Joe Block. Sorry.

15 MR. BLOCK: That's Jon, J-O-N, short for Jonathan.

16 SEN. KILKELLY: Okay.

17 MR. BLOCK: I represent Citizens Awareness Network,
18 Friends of the Coast Opposing Nuclear Pollution, the
19 Nuclear Information Resource Service, and, on an
20 occasional basis, the New England Coalition on Nuclear
21 Pollution.

22 I've been invited up here by Friends of the Coast
23 because I've done some work for them in the past.
24 They're also aware of the fact that I've been involved
25 in one way or another legally in decommissioning the

1 Rowe plant, in decommissioning the Connecticut Yankee
2 plant, and I have an observation, after looking at the
3 PSDAR submitted in this case.

4 I think you should congratulate yourselves that it's
5 almost twice as long as the one in Connecticut. That's
6 a real achievement.

7 Compared with what was done at Yankee Rowe, though,
8 you're weighing in pretty light. You had somewhere on
9 the order of 900-plus pages of studies that were
10 generated before decommissioning took place at that
11 plant.

12 And I want to say on the record to the NRC that I
13 believe just as there is no substitute for that kind of
14 activity and attention and detail in what you're doing
15 now, there is no substitute here in the process that
16 you're providing to the public.

17 While this is very nice for people to be able to
18 come and make their comments and to ventilate, and it's
19 very nice for the licensee and sites, at its option, to
20 offer advisory panels, it's not the same as having a
21 public formal process in which information can be
22 cross-examined and which the public is entitled to
23 demand to see records and to have its experts examine
24 what information is put out by the licensee and by the
25 agency.

1 It is also no substitute to have the licensee turn
2 out a 10- or 20-page outline, compared with what was
3 required in the past.

4 Finally, an observation. When we were down at
5 Connecticut Yankee at their PSDAR meeting, I mentioned
6 to the then project director, when he said that
7 according to his calculations the 90-day period for
8 commencement of activity would be from the day that the
9 PSDAR appeared in your fax machines at NRC headquarters.
10 And I said, no, it's when it appears in the Federal
11 Register.

12 And I say it again. That is public notice, not when
13 you get it and open the envelope in your office. And I
14 think you should consider that and you should consider
15 making that a stable part of your calculation. Because
16 it's a reasonable thing, and it's also something that
17 historically has been taken as the way in which public
18 notice is given. Publication in the Federal Register
19 marks public notice.

20 Thank you.

21 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you very much.

22 Raymond Shadis?

23 MR. SHADIS: That last name is S-H-A-D-I-S.

24 We get hung up on process here. But Marge, we've
25 got a situation here where we're going to expend \$508

1 million on the short side. I will bet Mr. Meisner a
2 lobster dinner that when it's over it will be closer to
3 a billion dollars.

4 We're going to undertake a process here that's going
5 to roll on for 7, 8, 10, 12 years, whatever -- damn near
6 a decade, and we are permitted five minutes for public
7 comment.

8 Now, I understand that we can submit written
9 comment, but we have done that with NRC. And really, we
10 could save the postage and just file our comments in the
11 wastebasket.

12 Here's a letter I have from the NRC. It's dated
13 October 21, 1997:

14 Dear Mr. Shadis:

15 This letter is in regard to concerns you brought to
16 the attention of the NRC on February 4, 1997, at a
17 Commission meeting. As you probably know, the licensee
18 has decided not to restart the Maine Yankee facility.
19 On this basis, we are evaluating the concerns to
20 determine future review activities. We will inform you
21 of that decision soon.

22 Gene Lee, Senior Allegations Coordinator, Office of
23 Very Slow Turtles, apparently.

24 Now, I'm going to tell you that we've been invited
25 to do the 2.206 process. The 2.206 process is a

1 useless, virtually useless process.

2 Between 1985 and 1992, when UCS, the Union of
3 Concerned Scientists, published a report on that
4 process, NRC granted the petitioners their way in the
5 2.206 process exactly zero times.

6 Were they a bunch of radical anti-nuclear freaks?
7 No.

8 The State of Massachusetts, for example, wanted to
9 have a public review of safety issues at the Pilgrim
10 Nuclear Power Station, and NRC held them at bay until
11 they could come to some kind of agreement with the
12 licensee. That's the State of Massachusetts.

13 Do you think that we citizenry are going to get the
14 respect that the state of Massachusetts got? I don't
15 think so. We won't even get that much.

16 And therefore, our only opportunity to deal with
17 this decade-long, probably billion dollar process, with
18 effects that will last 500 years on this coast, is in
19 this five minutes. I don't think it's adequate.

20 I don't know how any rational person can say that to
21 come up here and stump for nuclear power or say what a
22 great town we have or wonderful -- what are we called --
23 Community Advisory Panel we have is in any way
24 contributing to taking this issue apart. And the issue
25 is the adequacy and the relevance and the accuracy of

1 the PSDAR.

2 That document is premature and it is incomplete.
3 NRC requires that that document tell them an
4 approximation of costs and give them a schedule and
5 refer to environmental impacts. Well, the NRC does not
6 have enough information in the PSDAR to accept it.

7 The licensee, which is a wonderful company -- we all
8 know that -- the licensee does not know if they're going
9 to tear the reactor vessel apart into sections like a
10 grapefruit. They don't know if they're going to try to
11 bury it wholesale with the internals intact or not.

12 You cannot tell me that the doses all equal out.
13 And doses mean money, and we know that. It means extra
14 workers. It means more people taking a cumulative dose.

15 The licensee does not know if they are going to
16 maintain the spent fuel pool or if they are going to
17 bring in the 130 ton cylinders, about 60 of them, I
18 guess it is, and those things are not cheap.

19 They don't have a clue whether they're going to do
20 one activity or another. How, then, can they begin to
21 estimate costs without even a wide variation in costs.
22 They didn't say it's going to cost between 500 and 700
23 million. There's no leeway there. It's like one cost.
24 This is it. I don't think so. It does not make sense.

25 Site characterization is the big issue down at

1 Connecticut Yankee. Now they have a problem in their
2 estimate as to whether or not they're really covering
3 \$100 million worth of earth removal. That's a big chunk
4 of change. It's a big scheduling factor. It's a big
5 environmental factor.

6 Maine Yankee started their site characterization
7 this week. They have not got a clue what they are going
8 to find in site characterization.

9 So we're left with a document that is not only
10 shallow in the sense that it is 18 pages to cover a
11 decade's worth of work and at least a half a billion
12 dollars, but it's also a document that's incomplete.

13 I've got probably 30 pages of notes here. And if
14 the process is intended to keep it from the public, then
15 the process is successful.

16 I'll give you one last little note. Maine Yankee
17 has made a point of saying it's near Wiscasset Airport
18 and only light aircraft fly overhead. Well, damn near
19 every day, P-3 Orions, this aircraft, from Brunswick
20 Naval Air Station, fly up and down the Sheepscot River,
21 and they use it to line their planes up so they can go
22 on submarine patrol. I don't know what they carry, but
23 when they have a full load they weigh 66,000 pounds.
24 And they chug along at about 250 mile-an-hour, and I've
25 seen them flying at 300 feet.

1 Those planes are so constructed that they can carry
2 Harpoon air-to-sea missiles. Those are nuclear-tipped
3 missiles. I'd hate like hell to see one of those things
4 fall into Maine Yankee.

5 And I do wish that the company would talk to
6 Brunswick Naval Air Station to see if we can get the P-3
7 Orions and the jumbo refueling jets that also fly up and
8 down the river to take a different course.

9 Thanks for the five minutes. And really and truly,
10 NRC, in respect to the way this hearing is run, thanks
11 for nothing.

12 SEN. KILKELLY: Ann D. Burt?

13 MS. BURT: That's B-U-R-T. My name is Ann D. Burt,
14 and I live in Edgecomb, two miles from the plant.

15 And I'm very concerned about process, as Mr. Shadis
16 spoke, as well. According to the dates that we were
17 given tonight, Maine Yankee could begin major
18 decommissioning activities on November 25th. It's only
19 19 days from tonight.

20 I want to ask the NRC how you can possibly take the
21 comments that we are making tonight, the input -- and it
22 has been citizens, it's been whistleblowers, and it has
23 been company employees who have found serious problems
24 over the years at the plant. How you can possibly take
25 into serious consideration comments that we are making

1 and to allow Maine Yankee to go forward with their
2 decommissioning.

3 Ray talked about the fact that we have yet to get a
4 response to a 2.206 petition that we submitted nearly
5 two years ago.

6 I guess I wonder, does the public really have any
7 power. And also, we've heard from -- we know that there
8 is a Citizens Advisory Panel that's been raised, and --
9 that has been formed, and that they are continuing to
10 meet, and that the public can come to that. If they
11 raise concerns during this process over the next ten
12 years, will the decommissioning plan -- will it be
13 changed if we find problems with it? Will there be
14 changes? That's basically my concerns.

15 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

16 Kris Christine?

17 MS. CHRISTINE: I've already spoken.

18 SEN. KILKELLY: All set?

19 Michael Mayhew?

20 MR. MAYHEW: I'm Michael Mayhew, M-A-Y-H-E-W.

21 I'm a professional engineer and energy consultant.
22 I have worked for the two major electric utilities in
23 the state. I'm currently working for the other major
24 utility in the state as an energy consultant.

25 I grew up being very technically oriented. I was

1 all for the breeder reactor technology and fusion and
2 all of the great hopes of the sixties. But we realized
3 we had some problems, and things did not pan out like we
4 had hoped.

5 The spent fuel that DOE was going to take back and
6 feed the breeder reactors was -- it didn't happen. And
7 we've known for a long time it wasn't going to happen.
8 It wasn't three months ago that, all of a sudden, the
9 Department of Energy wasn't going to be able to take the
10 nuclear fuel from the reactor.

11 It wasn't that many years ago that Sebago Lake
12 looked like the best place in the United States to stick
13 the spent fuel, underneath the aquifer for the Greater
14 Portland water supply. And we fought very hard to keep
15 that, and I think that maybe gave the people of Maine an
16 idea of what to expect out of federal leadership from
17 Washington. You know, so the source for the State of
18 Maine's largest city is threatened with this nuclear
19 storage.

20 But I really am a lot more than an engineer. That
21 is just my profession. I have a family that means much
22 more to me than that. There is -- I have four children
23 that are living. I have one who isn't written as a
24 nuclear death, and he may or may not have anything to do
25 with it.

1 Gregory, who died five years ago, was six days old,
2 and he died with a congenital heart problem. And
3 because we live five miles from the plant, was it
4 prudent of me living there when I know there are some
5 technical problems? Maybe not. Two months later, I
6 packed the family up and I moved 100 miles away, and
7 I've been there until we shut down the plant again. And
8 I'm back.

9 And my family has lived in Maine for generations.
10 Gregorys are descendants of the Native Americans, who
11 lived here. And you know, the Barters -- he's a Barter
12 from Barter's Island, just down the river from Maine
13 Yankee.

14 And it's a shame to force the people of Maine to
15 leave an area because they don't feel it's prudent with
16 the risks. And if you are looking at risks, we should
17 not be talking about what is the cost of shutting down
18 the plant tomorrow, it's what is the societal costs.
19 And Maine is a lot more than a nuclear generating
20 facility that runs night and day dumping out power. And
21 that legacy is over, but now we've got the spent fuel
22 and let's look at how we can take care of it as safely
23 as possible. And the first cost isn't the issue. And
24 those \$200 million or \$120 million, or whatever the
25 number that changed the last three months, we know

1 that's -- whatever the final amount is, it's not that
2 number. And whatever number you put it on, it's
3 probably wrong today. But it's a very large number.

4 And the biggest thing is the credibility of the
5 management of the plant has been in question. It was
6 not operated safely. I hope the NRC is going to keep
7 their thumb on this, because I don't think myself and a
8 lot of people in the area feel real comfortable with
9 things being based on a first-cost issue.

10 Thank you.

11 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

12 Mike McConnell?

13 MR. McCONNELL: Hi, my name is Mike McConnell from
14 Boothbay.

15 I think you know my concern is overboard discharge.
16 This, I hope, doesn't tie in with what Michael was just
17 talking about.

18 A week ago or so I had a conversation with a Maine
19 Yankee engineer. I confirmed it with some state
20 officials. That in the past, some years past,
21 radioactive particulates specific to Maine Yankee have
22 been found in lobsters in the Sheepscot River.

23 When you look at my baseball CAP, you'll see that I
24 deal with lobsters. I lobster in the Sheepscot. I give
25 lobsters from the Sheepscot to my friends. That doesn't

1 make me feel good, knowing a week ago now, that all the
2 lobsters that I have given to friends, sold and gone
3 elsewhere may have had particulates.

4 These particulates that were found were under legal
5 limits, so, according to the federal regulations, and
6 everything, it's just fine. Except if one of those
7 radioactive particles lodge against a cell in someone's
8 body and a disintegration breaks a DNA code of one cell,
9 you can have a cancer. That bothers me a lot.

10 The operational water on-site in the reactor water
11 storage tank, in the steam generators, in the test
12 tanks, has all that been released? That's a question
13 for someone in Maine Yankee.

14 SEN. KILKELLY: We'll be -- this is the comment
15 period, so we'll be doing questions and getting those
16 questions responded to.

17 So the question is has that water been released
18 that's in the holding tank?

19 MR. McCONNELL: Well, I should end right now,
20 because I've got a bunch of questions.

21 SEN. KILKELLY: Then just -- I mean, putting them on
22 the record will get them answered.

23 MR. McCONNELL: Okay. I want to know if the 300- to
24 400,000 gallons of radioactive water, liquid on-site,
25 has been dumped.

1 I want to know, once the decommissioning process
2 begins -- I have a feeling there won't be anymore
3 tritium produced, but I'm not sure, because the plant
4 isn't operational. So it will just be fission products
5 and particulates, I think, from the piping and reactor
6 and clean-down, and all that, that will be dumped
7 overboard. I was wondering about that.

8 And what the daily or annual limits, the amount of
9 curies that's accepted. Is that done on a yearly basis,
10 daily basis, monthly basis? What's the upper limits
11 that can be dumped overboard?

12 I want to know which people are responsible for the
13 dumping? In other words, if the contractor comes in,
14 cuts up the plant, and creates a lot of water, and if
15 they decide to dump this overboard, when they turn the
16 valves to dump it overboard, is it Maine Yankee being
17 responsible for that or is it the contractor?

18 Is there going to be -- at each dumping into the
19 river, is there going to be an inspector on-site? NRC
20 guy, state guy, whatever?

21 Another question about the chemicals. It says in
22 the PSDAR that the interior surfaces of piping systems
23 can be contaminated using various chemical solutions.
24 Which chemicals are they?

25 The objectives of the decontamination effort are

1 twofold; first, to reduce the radiation levels. When
2 they've got this radioactive liquid with the chemicals,
3 are they going to separate the chemicals from the
4 radioactivity and dump it overboard, or dump it all
5 overboard?

6 Second, clean such material as to -- as if possible
7 unrestricted use levels per disposal as salvage, which
8 means they can take it to a local landfill, piping. I
9 want to know which local dumps have been designated to
10 accept so-called clean salvage and which guy is going to
11 monitor that. And once it leaves the site, the state
12 needs to monitor that, because if it's been radioactive
13 once, cleaned, we need verification that when it goes to
14 that landfill that it really is.

15 The last part I've got is in the sampling of the
16 mud-flats. I was reading some environmental reports
17 that in the early years of Maine Yankee there was a lot
18 of radioactive sediment. In a later sampling, they went
19 down deep and they found some more, but they figured it
20 was from the early dumpings, so they began to take
21 samples that weren't as deep in the sediment. I want to
22 know at what levels Duratek was sampling the mud-flats.

23 That's all.

24 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you very much.

25 Ken Gray?

1 MR. GRAY: I'll pass.

2 SEN. KILKELLY: Okay. John Hasleton.

3 MR. HASLETON: I'll pass.

4 SEN. KILKELLY: Okay. Al Capristo.

5 MR. CAPRISTO: Good evening. My name is Al
6 Capristo, C-A-P-R-I-S-T-O. I'm a Wiscasset resident and
7 a Maine Yankee employee, and tonight I'm here
8 representing myself.

9 Like many residents of this community and like many
10 employees of the plant, I was very sad to see the
11 decision to shut the plant down early; but,
12 unfortunately, we all move on from that.

13 I, like hundreds of professionals that I work with,
14 including the NRC inspector and the state inspector at
15 the site, set our sights every day on doing the very
16 best job we can, along with hundreds of professionals
17 working to safely and cost-effectively decommission the
18 Maine Yankee facility.

19 I'd like to merely just point out that we welcome
20 the NRC oversight and state oversight on that process,
21 and I commit to you my effort and the effort of hundreds
22 of employees to do the very best job we can in
23 decommissioning the facility.

24 Thank you.

25 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

1 Senator Treat?

2 SEN. TREAT: Sharon Treat, T-R-E-A-T.

3 I represent the residents of District 18 in the
4 State of Maine. That is the district that comes down
5 the Kennebec River as far south as Richmond. I, myself,
6 live in Gardiner.

7 I'll also mention that I take a particular interest
8 in this issue, not only because I live fairly nearby,
9 but I am the Senate Chair of the Natural Resources
10 Committee and I serve on the Radioactive Waste Advisory
11 Commission.

12 In preparing these comments, I have reviewed the
13 PSDAR, the 1972 Environmental Impact Statement for the
14 Maine Yankee Atomic Power Station, the 1988 Final
15 Generic Environmental Impact Statement on
16 Decommissioning of Nuclear Facilities, which was
17 prepared by the Nuclear Regulatory Commission, and the
18 relevant agency regulations governing decommissioning as
19 set forth in the recent Federal Register notice.

20 These comments are really follow-up to what I
21 mentioned in the previous meeting when I raised
22 questions about whether or not an environmental impact
23 statement is required in this process, and when and how.

24 At that time the answer to the question that I was
25 given was that an environmental impact statement is not

1 required, that it is included in the generic
2 environmental impact statement of 1988 and the original
3 environmental impact statement done in 1972.

4 Therefore, I did review those documents to see
5 whether or not I felt they meet the standard of an
6 environmental impact statement. And I would just
7 mention I am an environmental lawyer and do spend some
8 time looking at environmental impact statements.

9 In my opinion, the PSDAR does not adequately discuss
10 the reasons for concluding that an environmental impact
11 associated with the site-specific decommissioning
12 activities will be bounded by these documents. That's
13 the standard that's in the NRC regulations.

14 The reasons that I draw that conclusion is that the
15 PSDAR is very short -- it's about what, 18 or 19 pages
16 -- a vague and inconclusive document that fails to
17 select any specific decommissioning activities.

18 Without a specific plan, it is simply impossible to
19 evaluate the environmental and public health impacts.
20 Indeed, I was somewhat at a loss as to how to comment
21 tonight because it was so inconclusive. I'll just give
22 you a couple of examples of the kinds of things that
23 disturb me.

24 For example, it notes that Maine Yankee, quote, may
25 transfer spent fuel from wet storage to dry storage. It

1 doesn't choose an option. That's at page 4.

2 It states that it may segment the reactor vessel and
3 place the segments into shielded containers. On the
4 other hand, it also states that it may not. It may
5 prepare the vessel for shipment intact.

6 It states that the waste may be incinerated,
7 compacted or otherwise processed. It doesn't say
8 whether they will or won't.

9 Where will these activities be carried out? I'd
10 personally like to know. Is that happening on-site?

11 That's the type of thing that's in there. In my
12 opinion, if you're going to evaluate whether or not the
13 environmental impacts of this decommissioning are
14 already addressed in other documents, you have to have a
15 specific plan to be able to make that determination.

16 In addition, the PSDAR fails to compare the Maine
17 Yankee site in Wiscasset to the hypothetical generic
18 site, which is evaluated in the GEIS that was prepared
19 in 1988. Without such a comparison, it is impossible to
20 determine whether the environmental impacts associated
21 with the site-specific decommissioning activities will
22 be bounded by appropriate previously issued
23 environmental impact statements.

24 Again, that's the standard in the regulations that
25 are applicable.

1 The generic 1988 decommissioning EIS, which I did
2 review, combined with the 1972 Maine Yankee EIS, which I
3 also reviewed -- it was rather difficult to obtain at
4 this late date -- it's 25 years old -- do not meet the
5 requirements of the National Environmental Policy Act,
6 when you put them together, without a specific
7 site-specific environmental impact statement addressing
8 the particular situation that we're facing today.

9 In addition to requiring a more detailed PSDAR
10 specifically describing the decommissioning, I'm
11 requesting the Nuclear Regulatory Commission to prepare
12 it's own environmental impact statement, because the
13 decommissioning is indeed a major federal action
14 significantly affecting the human environment. That is
15 a standard under the National Environmental Policy Act.

16 As I said, I reviewed the 1988 GEIS, generic
17 environmental impact statement, and I discovered it's
18 based on no experience with decommissioning. In fact,
19 they refer to a laboratory analysis that they did and
20 one reactor that was a test reactor.

21 Since that GEIS was written, obviously the
22 Commission is getting more experienced, and I would
23 suggest -- in fact, I would request that if the NRC is
24 going to rely on a generic impact statement, it should
25 update it to reflect the actual experience that they are

1 now having with decommissioning.

2 In addition, obviously a generic impact statement is
3 not site-specific. No site-specific information has
4 been prepared on the environmental impacts of
5 decommissioning Maine Yankee. I question whether
6 putting the generic impact statement together with the
7 1972 impact statement, which is site-specific, does
8 anything.

9 I have reviewed the '72 plan. There is no data or
10 discussion whatsoever about decommissioning. It is
11 entirely based on the concerns with plant construction
12 and operations. So it is totally irrelevant to this
13 discussion.

14 That's under current NRC regulations. So if one
15 were to say that the current regulations are okay, I
16 believe you would still have to conclude that the PSDAR
17 is an inadequate response to that and that it fails to
18 meet the environmental impact statement requirements
19 even within those regulations.

20 But I agree with people who have stated already this
21 evening that those regulations are not adequate.
22 They're not adequate because, as has been noted already,
23 there is no public hearing opportunity. Previously,
24 there was an adjudicatory hearing opportunity, with
25 cross-examination, opportunity to have discovery and get

1 documents.

2 As also has been noted, there is a court cause that
3 has, in fact, ruled that the decision not to do that,
4 not to have public hearings, is in violation of the
5 National Environmental Policy Act and was arbitrary and
6 capricious. And I think that that is a decision in this
7 federal circuit, and I think that it should control this
8 case.

9 In addition, I am asking the NRC to require Maine
10 Yankee to evaluate the costs and the measures that would
11 be needed to comply with the EPA standard for cleaning
12 up a site to background radiological levels, as opposed
13 to the NRC standard.

14 I think when they do their cost study they should
15 look at both. And I would like to know what that amount
16 of money is.

17 Certainly, they should be cleaning up to the most
18 protective standard, particularly if people in this area
19 would like to reuse the site. I think a site that
20 doesn't even meet Superfund standards is not going to
21 get very many tenants, if it's turned into an industrial
22 park. I just have trouble imagining that commercial
23 businesses are going to be interested in being on a site
24 that does not meet Superfund standards.

25 Until a detailed decommissioning plan is submitted

1 and a site-specific environmental impact statement is
2 prepared and a public hearing is scheduled and held, I
3 am requesting that the NRC not permit the dismantling
4 and decommissioning of Maine Yankee to take place.

5 I think it is very premature. I'm reassured to hear
6 that there is no intention, apparently, to do any
7 dismantling activities until a year from now. But it's
8 technically possible under the current regulations. And
9 the NRC should be the one that is making that decision.
10 And I'm requesting that the NRC make sure that those
11 activities do not take place until we know what is
12 planned and we have had a real opportunity to evaluate
13 those plans in a really open and inclusive process.

14 Thank you very much.

15 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

16 David Hall?

17 MR. HALL: I'm David Hall, spelled H-A-L-L. I'm
18 from West Bath, Maine.

19 I'm speaking for myself, but as one who has some
20 experience, because I am the Radiological Defense
21 Officer for Sagadahoc County Emergency Management
22 Agency. I am also a member of the state Radiological
23 Emergency Preparedness Committee.

24 I have a concern about emergency planning. Maine
25 Yankee will want to cut back on emergency planning in

1 order to save money. We must be sure that the remaining
2 emergency planning is adequate to meet the potential
3 worst-case situations. As I see it, the two major risks
4 to public safety are the transport of large amounts of
5 radioactive waste and the state of the spent fuel pool.

6 When radioactive waste is shipped, it must be
7 properly packaged and shielded. Enough money must be
8 spent so that it is done right. There must also be
9 adequate response plans for the entire route in case
10 there is an accident or a spill.

11 The spent fuel pool contains millions of curies of
12 radioactive material, more than the reactor vessel had
13 when the plant was operated. The pool was not designed
14 to contain this much radioactive material. The pool has
15 no containment building to protect the outside world
16 from what is inside. There is absolutely nothing to
17 protect us if things go wrong.

18 What would happen if all the water drained out of
19 the spent fuel pool? Would there be enough heat to melt
20 the fuel rods? Would radioactive gas and steam be
21 released?

22 I hope a thorough study is made in regard to the
23 worst-case scenarios in the spent fuel pool in order to
24 determine the level of emergency planning that is still
25 required. I am extremely concerned that everything will

1 be let go in regard to emergency planning when it should
2 not be let go until we really know what the risks are.

3 If the spent fuel rods are removed from the pool and
4 are packed in dry-cask storage, I expect the threat to
5 the public will be less and the level of emergency
6 planning could be reduced.

7 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you very much.

8 Maria Holt.

9 MS. HOLT: Thank you, Senator Kilkelly. Holt,
10 H-O-L-T, from Bath.

11 I was going to give up this speaking opportunity
12 until I heard Mr. Grant say something I need to address.

13 First, I want people to know that I and most of my
14 friends have perfect faith in people like Mr. Grant and
15 the other gentleman who works at Maine Yankee to do the
16 very best job possible in protecting us during the
17 decommissioning. But I am tired to tears of hearing the
18 risks of radioactive contamination compared to dying in
19 a plane crash or a car crash.

20 When we die in a car crash, we're dead. We have not
21 somehow passed on that possibility of dying in a car
22 crash to our children.

23 In 1975, the Atomic Energy Commission decided it was
24 okay. They were planning about the emissions from the
25 light-water reactor industry, and they thought that we

1 needed it, we needed the reactors producing energy -- or
2 electricity. So they went ahead with these predictions
3 and models, calculations, saying, well, because we need
4 this technology, it will be okay to assume that we might
5 have a 10% increase in the genetic mutation rate.

6 Now, Dr. Joshua Lederburg was on a panel. He's a
7 professor at Stanford University. He tried very hard to
8 get them to reduce that to 1%, if at all. It seems to
9 me a crime to plan to increase the genetic mutation
10 rate. He was unsuccessful.

11 But the United States government thinks enough of
12 Dr. Lederburg today or recently to have asked him to
13 help assess the health problems of the Gulf War
14 veterans. And we haven't found that out yet. But he's
15 a respected scientist.

16 This is a sad situation, that we are led to believe
17 it's the same kind of risk.

18 Thank you.

19 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

20 Pat Dostie?

21 MR. DOSTIE: My name is Pat Dostie. I live in
22 Augusta. My last name is spelled D-O-S-T-I-E. I'm the
23 state Nuclear Safety Inspector at the Maine Yankee
24 facility. I'm with the Office of Nuclear Safety, and
25 I'm representing the Department of Human Services.

1 Tonight we transmitted some comments to the NRC
2 staff that is here in written form. But before I
3 preface some of those comments, I would like to say that
4 over the last couple of months we've been working very
5 hard with Maine Yankee to be integrated in their
6 processes. We have been involved with the chemical
7 DECON that is being contemplated in that project.
8 We've also been involved in the spent fuel pool island
9 project. But none has taken precedence, as far as I'm
10 concerned, to the site characterization process. And by
11 that, I basically mean that I'm spending more time on
12 that facet than I am on some of the other activities at
13 the site.

14 And before I preface any of the remarks here, I'd
15 like to say that I have raised some comments and some
16 observations to the Maine Yankee staff. I've also
17 raised those same comments and those observations to the
18 NRC staff; but working both with the NRC staff as well
19 as the Maine Yankee staff to resolve some of those
20 comments that we've had.

21 The other thing I would like to say here is that the
22 four comments that I have tonight, I guess, can be
23 encapsulated into four cute -- I shouldn't say cute --
24 four categories. One is based on experience, another
25 one is very specific to the PSDAR, one is a regular

1 comment, and finally another one is a comment
2 recommendation.

3 On the first part of it, I would say that we are
4 trying to keep up with all the activities that are
5 happening at the plant. That includes not only all the
6 paperwork that is occurring, but the licensee submittals
7 and exemption requests, detailed tech specs, etc., etc.,
8 but also what's happening with spent fuel heat-up tests,
9 observations of activities on-site, and, of course,
10 being involved in the site characterization numbers.

11 In the observation I basically have here is, because
12 of our limited resources, we've had some difficulty to
13 keep up with the pace. And, at times, if we want
14 something in a timely fashion, it's been difficult to
15 produce that.

16 The second thing here is very specific to the PSDAR.
17 On page 15 is a table of costs, and some people have
18 already heard me mention this before, but there is a
19 summary there of the 1993 to 1997 costs, and one of the
20 things it identifies in the other cost category is
21 property taxes, insurance, energy, NRC and state fees,
22 etc., etc., and it shows a total for the year 1997 of
23 approximately almost \$5 million -- \$4.988, to be exact.

24 We feel that somehow maybe TRG was not aware of
25 certain things that we considered deficient in the sense

1 that if we take a look at the current oversight
2 functions that the state is performing, the various
3 agencies, with Uldis Vanags, the state Nuclear Safety
4 Advisor, the Public Health Lab doing the analyses, with
5 the radiation control program that has to do with the
6 environmental surveillance, and also myself and the
7 state low-level waste coordinator that is the staff
8 person for the advisory commission.

9 When you total all those at present and project out
10 for seven years, we're talking in excess of \$4 million.

11 Now, Maine Yankee's in the process of returning a --
12 as you know from the Citizens Advisory Panel, I've
13 mentioned that their particular list did not include
14 state fees, and I was assured that it was either under
15 the remaining costs or the fixed costs, but I'm still
16 waiting for a breakdown on that.

17 The other one here has been specifically mentioned
18 to both sides, and that is basically there is a fine
19 balance between safety and cost-effectiveness. I
20 presume that that will be maintained.

21 My basic comment is I hope that over time it does
22 not unduly shift those economic considerations, because
23 I would not want to see a resurrection of some of the
24 shortcomings that were identified by the ISAT.

25 And I agree with both sides that the emphasis should

1 be on quality and that by doing the job right the first
2 time, it would be the most appropriate way for all
3 parties concerned.

4 And finally, my final comment and recommendation is
5 this: Maine Yankee has made mention that it wants to be
6 a model to the industry. I think we've already had a
7 hint in a sense that they've submitted the PSDAR in 20
8 days after cessation of operations.

9 The other example I would like to say is, over the
10 past, where we've had some -- where every light-water
11 reactor has gone through a refueling, refuelings have
12 lasted anywhere from 8 to 12 weeks, the industry has
13 responded not only trying to save money, but also save,
14 you know, personnel exposure. And in the process we're
15 now seeing some facilities going down as much as down to
16 19 or 20 days in order to do refueling.

17 And my basic comment is this: If the industry is
18 going to learn, and I'm presuming that it's certainly
19 going to learn from Maine Yankee experiences as well as
20 Connecticut Yankee and some of the others, that if seven
21 years is doable, then most likely you can probably see a
22 compression of that to maybe six or five or maybe
23 slightly less. I'm sure there is a limit.

24 And my basic comment is this: As the NRC takes a
25 look at the way the process is, then one of the things

1 that they should make sure here is they should look at
2 the allocation of its resources to ensure that the
3 appropriate oversight is achieved with the lower of
4 time, because it will happen.

5 And that's basically all my comments.

6 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

7 Jim Hummer?

8 MR. HUMMER: I'm Jim Hummer, H-U-M-M-E-R. I live in
9 Bath with my family. I'm a rate-payer. I don't
10 represent any group tonight.

11 From what I've heard here tonight and observations
12 that I've made in the past couple of decades, it seems
13 to me that we have more common ground that it would
14 appear. We also have some mutual suspicion. But I
15 don't think that anyone here wants to see anyone at the
16 plant or the surrounding communities to be hurt by
17 radiation or any other hazard. And most of us probably
18 don't want to waste money. And I don't believe that
19 anyone wants to damage the environment.

20 I feel, personally, that the public suspicion of
21 nuclear power has made it safer, although I don't know
22 how common that feeling is. The suspicion levels may be
23 too high.

24 Now, I hope that we can build on the interests that
25 you all have in common, and I wish the Community

1 Advisory Panel every success.

2 Thank you.

3 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you.

4 That's the end of our list. Are there others that
5 wish to speak that did not get on the list?

6 Yes?

7 MR. BROWN: My name is Jay Brown. I live in Alna.

8 And I work at the plant as well.

9 Everything I heard tonight I think is good stuff.
10 People are concerned about the safety of
11 decommissioning. I think that's good. But it's there
12 and it has to come apart. I'm an engineer. We all
13 didn't devise nuclear power in the sixties, fifties.
14 But it's here and we have to take it apart.

15 And I heard one thing that I have an issue with. I
16 think it was Ms. Katz talked about something at Rowe
17 where it may have been safer to wait. Maybe it would be
18 better to wait 15 years, 30 years, and then take it
19 apart. I disagree with that from the safety standpoint.

20 The time to do it is now. The people are there. We
21 know the plant. We know the status of the systems. And
22 I think it would be just like doing a project at your
23 house that you start, put down, and try to pick up a
24 month later. You don't remember where you left off,
25 what's the status, what are you going to do, where are

1 the tools. And I think the longer you wait the greater
2 the risk it is.

3 So I just wanted to put my pitch in to the safest
4 time is now.

5 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you. Are there others?

6 Yes, Uldis?

7 MR. VANAGS: Uldis Vanags, State Nuclear Safety
8 Advisor. I'd just like to make some comments on the
9 PSDAR.

10 As I think you heard from most of the public, it's a
11 difficult document to comment on. It is written
12 generally. It's really a general sketch, an outline of
13 what Maine Yankee plans to do. The details, many of
14 them have not been determined yet.

15 I understand than Maine Yankee will use the 50.59
16 process, and that will be the process that they will use
17 to dismantle the plant. Within that process, the
18 environmental concerns are dealt with and addressed, I
19 understand.

20 And the important aspect of that that I see is that
21 because there is no specific plan outlined at this time,
22 it will be very important for the state to communicate
23 very closely with the NRC and Maine Yankee. We will
24 have to work very closely together to make sure that we
25 fully understand what is taking place at the plant and

1 that we understand what the NRC is thinking of doing at
2 the same time also.

3 And as these plans are developed, we want to have
4 opportunity and time to comment before these activities
5 do take place. So we would like the coordination to
6 assure that we have this ample time.

7 Because Maine Yankee clearly wants to decommission
8 this plant fairly quickly. Whether or not they'll be
9 able to or not, we have yet to see. As many have
10 stated, the plan is really not in place yet. There are
11 some details, really important details, missing.

12 So, I'd just like to say that I would like to -- the
13 state would like to work cooperatively with Maine Yankee
14 and the NRC, and make sure that this is what everyone
15 wants, is the safe, efficient dismantling of the plant.

16 Thank you.

17 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you. If there are no others
18 -- I'm sorry.

19 MR. WEBB: I have one last comment.

20 SEN. KILKELLY: Yes.

21 MR. WEBB: Mike Webb, NRC. We've already expressed
22 to Senator KilKelly, in her capacity as the chairman of
23 the Community Advisory Panel, that we are available to
24 come up to attend the Community Advisory Panel sessions.
25 We would appreciate some advance notice, both so that we

1 can bring somebody up and also so that we can have the
2 right person there to answer questions. But we will be
3 glad to participate in answering questions and, you
4 know, clarify issues that haven't been clear so far.

5 In addition, we would like to thank you for your
6 participation this evening. I know everybody took their
7 own time to come out here, but she specific has had a
8 little more -- has had to take a little more time to
9 prepare and has been up front. And the NRC really
10 appreciates that. And we'd like to thank you for
11 helping us.

12 (Applause.)

13 SEN. KILKELLY: Thank you. As we've mentioned,
14 there is a sign-up sheet in the back if you wish to
15 receive materials. They also are available on the NRC
16 web page, WWW.NRC.GOV.

17 The next meeting of the Citizens Advisory Panel is
18 going to be the first week in December, and there will
19 be information in the newspapers about that and also on
20 the Maine Yankee web site.

21 Thank you very much.

22 (Whereupon the meeting concluded at 10:10 p.m.)

23 - - - - -

24

25

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing is a true and
correct transcription of my stenographic notes taken of
the above-captioned matter.

Harold M. Hagopian
Registered Diplomat Reporter

